



Proceedings of the
3rd SPECIAL CONVENTION
and
70th ANNUAL CONVENTION

NCAA

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI / JANUARY 14-17, 1976

Proceedings
of the
**3rd Special
Convention**
and
**70th Annual
Convention**
of the
**National Collegiate
Athletic Association**

Stouffer's Riverfront Inn

St. Louis, Missouri

January 14-17, 1976



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

U.S. Highway 50 and Nall Avenue

P.O. Box 1906

Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222

913/384-3220

May 1976

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Register 1976

| | |
|--|----|
| Administrative Organization | 6 |
| Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media | 10 |

II. Proceedings of the Third Special Convention

| | |
|--|----|
| Opening Session | |
| 1. Opening Remarks | 26 |
| 2. Explanation of Voting Procedures | 26 |
| 3. Proposed Amendments | |
| Financial Aid | 28 |
| Campus Visitation | 28 |
| Recruiting Aids | 29 |
| Coaching Staffs | 29 |
| Limitations on Scouting | 29 |
| Preseason Practice | 31 |
| Playing Season | 32 |
| Number of Playing Dates | 34 |
| Out-of-Season Practice | 37 |
| Spring Football Practice | 37 |
| Outside Participation | 39 |
| Football Playing Season | 40 |
| Resolution: Television Plan | 43 |
| Amendments | 49 |
| Terminal Championships in Division III | 49 |
| Terminal Championships in Division II | 49 |
| Improper Expenses | 51 |
| Permissible Expenses | 52 |
| Athletic Awards | 52 |
| Permissible Expenses | 53 |

III. Proceedings of the 70th Annual Convention

| | |
|---|----|
| Opening Session | |
| 4. Opening Remarks | 54 |
| 5. Reports of Sports and General Committees | 55 |
| 6. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer | 55 |
| 7. Report of the Executive Committee | 57 |
| 8. Report of the Council | 59 |
| 9. Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee | 66 |
| Division I Round Table | 68 |
| Division II Round Table | 72 |
| Division III Round Table | 76 |
| General Round Table | 80 |
| Business Session | |
| 10. Opening Remarks | 99 |
| 11. Acceptance of the Report of the Council | 99 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 12. Proposed Amendments | |
| Determination of Financial Need | 100 |
| Honors Luncheon | 116 |
| Continuance of Business Session | |
| 13. Opening Remarks | 138 |
| 14. Proposed Amendments | |
| Determination of Financial Need (continued) | 139 |
| Resolution: Determination of Financial Need | 148 |
| Financial Aid | 150 |
| Maximum Awards | 151 |
| Multiple Sports Participation | 155 |
| Financial Aid Definition | 157 |
| Financial Aid—Equivalencies | 157 |
| Coaching Staffs | 158 |
| Final Business Session | |
| 15. Opening Remarks | 159 |
| 16. Proposed Amendments | |
| Coaching Staffs | 159 |
| Squad Limitations | 164 |
| Recruiting Benefits | 167 |
| Recruiting Contacts | 168 |
| Recruiting Contacts—Scouting | 175 |
| Recruiting Contacts—Service Academies | 175 |
| Recruiting—Publicity | 175 |
| Campus Visitations Limitations | 176 |
| Campus Visitation | 178 |
| Letter of Intent | 181 |
| Eligibility | 183 |
| Obligations of Membership—Legal Costs | 184 |
| Certification of Compliance | 189 |
| Institutional Eligibility | 189 |
| Enforcement Procedure | 189 |
| Due Process | 189 |
| Determination of Division | 190 |
| Change of Divisional Membership | 190 |
| Institutional Eligibility | 190 |
| Membership Division—Classification Committee .. | 191 |
| Resolution: Reorganization | 197 |
| Continuation of Final Business Session | |
| 17. Opening Remarks | 202 |
| 18. Proposed Amendments | |
| Membership Divisions—Guidelines | 202 |
| Membership Divisions—Probationary Status | 202 |
| Division I Criteria | 203 |
| Membership Divisions | 205 |
| Division III Criteria | 205 |
| Transfer of Membership | 206 |
| Resolution: Application of NCAA Rules | 206 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Resolution: Championships | 209 |
| Resolution: Committee and Study Programs | 209 |
| Amateurism—Agents | 213 |
| Resolution: Athletic Insurance | 213 |
| Transfer of Membership | 216 |
| Eligibility—2,000 Rule | 216 |
| Waivers | 218 |
| Institutional Eligibility | 218 |
| Eligibility for Championships | 218 |
| Institutional Eligibility | 218 |
| Transfer Rules | 219 |
| Eligibility | 221 |
| Individual Eligibility | 221 |
| Postseason Football Contests | 222 |
| Amendments | 223 |
| Extra Events Committee | 223 |
| Academic Standards | 223 |
| Out-of-Season Filming | 224 |
| Postseason Football Contests | 224 |
| Organizations—Meetings | 226 |
| 19. Report of the Committee on Committees | 226 |
| 20. Report of the Nominating Committee | 226 |

IV. Appendices

| | |
|---|-------|
| A. Special Convention Legislative Proposals | A- 1 |
| B. Annual Convention Legislative Proposals | A- 42 |
| C. Revisions of Executive Regulations | A-119 |
| D. Resolutions on Women's Athletics | A-128 |
| E. Amendments to Amendments and Other Proposals .. | A-131 |
| F. Summary of Length-of-Season Proposals | A-139 |
| G. Procedure of Determining Expected Family Contribution | A-141 |
| H. Expected Family Contribution Formula | A-143 |
| I. Financial Aid Application Form | A-149 |
| J. Division I Roll Call Vote on Proposal No. 100 | A-151 |
| K. Convention Committees | A-153 |
| L. Past and Present Association Officers | A-155 |
| M. NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1978 | A-156 |

NCAA Officers

President

JOHN A. FUZAK

Associate Dean, School for Advanced Studies in Education
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Secretary-Treasurer

STANLEY J. MARSHALL, Director of Athletics

Director, Health Physical Education and Recreation
South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota 57006

Executive Director

WALTER BYERS, U.S. Highway 50 and Nall Avenue
P.O. Box 1906, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222

The Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA President and Secretary-Treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chairman and secretary, respectively. Eight members of the Council are the eight district vice-presidents, each of whom is elected for two years and may be immediately reelected for one additional term. Eight vice-presidents-at-large are elected for terms of three years and may not be reelected until three years have elapsed.

Term Expires

- District 1 Vice-President**—Ross H. Smith Jan. 1978
Professor; Director of Athletics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Box D, MIT Station, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
- District 2 Vice-President**—Raymond J. Whispell Jan. 1977
Professor of Physical Education, Director of Athletics
Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pennsylvania 18104
- District 3 Vice-President**—Charley Scott Jan. 1978
Assistant Academic Vice-President
University of Alabama, P.O. Box 1933, University, Alabama 35486
- District 4 Vice-President**—Edwin L. Saxer Jan. 1977
Professor of Civil Engineering
University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 43606
- District 5 Vice-President**—James Frank Jan. 1978
President
Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
- District 6 Vice-President**—J. Neils Thompson Jan. 1977
Professor of Civil Engineering, Balcones Research Center,
Route 4, Box 189
University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78758
- District 7 Vice-President**—Harry E. Troxell Jan. 1978
Professor of Wood Science and Technology
Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

The Council (Continued)

- District 8 Vice-President**—Edward S. Betz Jan. 1977
Dean, All-University Programs
University of the Pacific, Stockton, California 95211
- Vice-President-at-Large**—Ernest C. Casale Jan. 1978
Director of Athletics; Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
- Vice-President-at-Large**—Cecil N. Coleman Jan. 1979
Director of Athletics
University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois 61820
- Vice-President-at-Large**—John R. Eiler Jan. 1978
Director of Athletics; Professor of Physical Education
East Stroudsburg State College, East Stroudsburg, Pa. 18301
- Vice-President-at-Large**—James E. Hawkins Jan. 1977
Professor; Director of Athletics
Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia 31030
- Vice-President-at-Large**—Hubert Heitman Jr. Jan. 1978
Assistant to the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, 517 Mark Hall
University of California, Davis, California 95616
- Vice-President-at-Large**—Franklin A. Lindeburg Jan. 1977
Supervisor of Physical Education
University of California, Riverside, California 92502
- Vice-President-at-Large**—Robert M. Strimer Jan. 1978
Director of Athletics; Chrm., Department of Physical Education
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio 43015
- Vice-President-at-Large**—John W. Winkin Jan. 1977
Administrative Assistant to the Director of Athletics
University of Maine, Orono, Maine 04473

Executive Committee

The NCAA President and Secretary-Treasurer shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The remaining eight members of the Committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year. Date of first election is shown in parentheses.

- Stan Bates (Jan. 1970)
Commissioner, Western Athletic Conference
1515 Cleveland Place, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80202
- William M. Bell (Jan. 1974)
Assistant to the Chancellor
Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301
- Robert C. James (Jan. 1976)
Commissioner, Atlantic Coast Conference
P.O. Box 6271, Summit Station, Greensboro, North Carolina 27405
- Earl M. Ramer (Jan. 1973)
Professor of Education and Chairman, Athletic Board,
13 Henson Hall
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
- Polk F. Robison (Jan. 1970)
Athletic Administrator of Finance and Development
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409
- Edgar A. Sherman (Jan. 1974)
Chairman, Health and Physical Education; Director of Athletics
Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio 43762
- Edward S. Steitz (Jan. 1974)
Professor; Director of Athletics
Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts 01109
- David Swank (Jan. 1975)
Associate Dean and Professor of Law
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73069

National Office

General Administration

- Walter Byers, *Executive Director*
Louis J. Spry, *Controller*
James H. Wilkinson, *Assistant Executive Director*
Marjorie Fieber, *Business Manager*

Enforcement

- Warren S. Brown, *Assistant Executive Director*
S. David Berst, *Executive Assistant*
William B. Hunt, *Executive Assistant*
J. Brent Clark, *Enforcement Representative*
James E. Delany, *Enforcement Representative*
Douglas W. Dunlop, *Enforcement Representative*
Hale McMenemy, *Enforcement Representative*
Robert J. Minnix, *Enforcement Representative*
Ronald J. Stratten, *Enforcement Representative*
Fannie B. Vaughan, *Administrative Assistant*

Events

- Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Assistant Executive Director*
Jerry A. Miles, *Director of Events*
Ralph McFillen, *Assistant Director of Events*
Dennis L. Poppe, *Assistant Director of Events*

NCAA Publishing Service

- Ted C. Tow, *Director*
Jonathan Clark, *Assistant Director*
C. Eugene Jacobs, *Assistant Director*
Maxine Alejos, *Circulation Manager*
Sheila M. Flanagan, *Publications Editor*
Wallace Renfro, *Production Manager*

Public Relations

- Thomas C. Hansen, *Assistant Executive Director*
David E. Cawood, *Director of Public Relations*
Jack N. Clark, *Director of Marketing*
James W. Shaffer, *Editor, NCAA News*
Shirley Whitacre, *Administrative Assistant*

NCAA Statistics Service

- John T. Waters, *Director*
Jim Van Valkenburg, *Associate Director*
Steve Boda, *Research*
Greg Mauldin, *Compilations*
Jules Winn, *Administrative Assistant*
Jim Wright, *Compilations*

Television News Service

- Ron Schwartz, *Director*
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019
212/541-8840

Film Service

- Richard S. Snider, *Director*
NCAA OFFICIAL FILMS
P. O. Box 2726
Wichita, Kansas 67201
Telephone 316/267-2828

3rd SPECIAL CONVENTION
70th ANNUAL CONVENTION
DELEGATES AND VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District One

American International College: Milton J. Piepul
 Amherst College: Benjamin F. McCabe
 Assumption College: Andrew Laska
 Babson College: E. William Olson
 Bates College: Robert W. Hatch
 Bentley College: Albert J. Harrington
 Boston College: Rev. Daniel Carroll, William J. Flynn
 Boston State College: James P. Sullivan
 Boston University: John B. Simpson
 Bowdoin College: Edmund L. Coombs
 Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis
 Bridgeport, University of: Francis Poisson
 Bridgewater State College: Edward C. Swenson
 Brown University: Robert A. Seiple, John Parry
 Central Connecticut State College: Lowell D. Lukas,
 William M. Moore
 Clark University: Russ Granger
 Connecticut, University of: John L. Toner
 Connecticut College: Charles Luce
 Dartmouth College: Seaver Peters
 Eastern Connecticut State College: William Holowaty
 Fairfield University: C. Donald Cook
 Hartford, University of: Roger A. Wickman
 Harvard University: Niki Janus, Dave Matthews, Robert B. Watson
 Keene State College: Sherry Bovinet, Stuart Goff
 Lowell, University of: James Cizek
 Maine, University of, Orono: Harold S. Westerman, John W. Winkin
 Massachusetts, University of: David C. Bischoff, Robert W. O'Connell
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Ross H. Smith
 Merrimack College: Thom Lawler
 Middlebury College: Richard W. Colman Jr.
 New Hampshire, University of: Andrew Mooradian
 New Haven, University of: Joseph A. Machnik
 Northeastern University: Herbert W. Gallagher, Joseph P. Zabilski
 Quinnipiac College: William E. Merrill
 Rhode Island, University of: Ernie Calverley
 Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
 St. Anselm's College: Edward F. Cannon Jr., Rev. Brendan P. Donnelly
 St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey
 Salem State College: William A. Gillis

Southeastern Massachusetts University: Harry Connolly
 Southern Connecticut State College: Ray DeFrancesco
 Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz
 Trinity College: Karl Kurth Jr.
 Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo
 Vermont, University of: Richard A. Farnham, Denis E. Lambert,
 James S. Pacy
 Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell
 Western New England College: Eric Geldart
 Westfield State College: Paul Bogan
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Robert W. Pritchard
 Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin
 Yale University: James G. Holgate, DeLaney Kiphuth

District Two

Adelphi University: Charles Voelker
 Albany, State University of New York: Joseph Garcia
 Allegheny College: Harold McElhaney
 American University: Robert H. Frailey
 Bernard M. Baruch College: Louis S. Brown
 Bethany College: Robert Goin
 Binghamton, State University of New York: Robert D. Kreidler
 Bloomsburg State College: Conrad A. Bautz
 Brooklyn College: Charles Tobey
 Bucknell University: Robert A. Latour
 Buffalo, State University College: Howard B. MacAdam, Thomas J.
 Quatroche
 Buffalo, State University of New York: Harry Fritz, John Medige
 C. W. Post College: William Ashley, Dennis L. Payette
 Canisius College: Daniel P. Starr
 Carnegie-Mellon University: James E. Banner
 Cheyney State College: Edwin W. Lawrence
 Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli
 Clarkson College of Technology: F. William Fiesinger
 Colgate University: Robert C. Deming
 Columbia University: Alvin R. Paul, Richard Sakala
 Cornell University: Robert J. Kane
 Cortland, State University College: Pete Corey, Katherine Ley, Roger
 I. Robinson
 Delaware, University of: Arnold M. Clark, Scotty Duncan, David M.
 Nelson
 Delaware Valley College: H. William Craver
 Dickinson College: David B. Eavenson
 Drew University: John A. Reeves
 Drexel University: John Semanik
 Duquesne University: John M. Manning
 East Stroudsburg State College: John R. Eiler
 Edinboro State College: Allan W. Hall
 Elizabethtown College: John M. Tulley
 Elmira College: Paul H. Brand, Jim Jewell
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Walter Marusyn, Harvey
 Woods
 Fordham University: Peter A. Carlesimo

Franklin and Marshall College: William A. Marshall
 Fredonia, State University College: Patrick R. Damore, Everett Phillips
 Geneseo, State University College: Robert F. Riedel
 George Washington University: Edward A. Caress, Robert K. Faris
 Georgetown University: Daniel J. Altobello, Mary Fenlon, Francis X. Rienzo, John Thompson
 Gettysburg College: Howard G. Shoemaker, Frank B. Williams
 Glassboro State College: Maurice G. Verbeke
 Hamilton College: Eugene Long
 Hampton Institute: Samuel E. Massenberg, Sylvius S. Moore
 Hartwick College: Leroy Chipman
 Haverford College: Dana W. Swan
 Hobart College: William C. Stiles
 Hofstra University: Paul Lynner
 Howard University: Henry Jones, Leo F. Miles
 Indiana (Pa.) University: John Chellman, Herman L. Sledzik
 Iona College: Peter J. McDermott
 Ithaca College: Charles A. Kerr
 Jersey City State College: Tom M. Gerrity
 Juniata College: Walter Nadzak Jr.
 Lafayette College: H. C. Kissiah, Olav B. Kollevoll
 LaSalle College: John J. Conboy, Joseph C. Mihalich
 Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby, Preston Parr
 LeMoyne College: Thomas J. Niland
 Lock Haven State College: Charles A. Eberle
 Long Island University: Jerry Donner
 Lycoming College: David G. Busey
 Manhattan College: Kenneth A. Norton
 Mansfield State College: Arthur DeGenaro
 Marist College: Ron Petro
 Maryland, University of (Eastern Shore): Joel C. Mack, Nelson E. Townsend
 Millersville State College: Lawrence McDermott
 Monmouth College: G. Buzzelli
 Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi
 Morgan State University: Earl Banks, Kenneth F. Jerkins
 Muhlenberg College: Raymond J. Whispell
 New York, City College of: Robert F. Greene, David J. Halberstam
 New York University: Daniel E. Quilty
 Niagara University: Rev. John W. Carven
 Oswego, State University College: John V. Glinski
 Pace University: Peter Finnerty
 Pennsylvania, University of: Richard L. Corrigan, Ferdinand A. Geiger, Connie Van Housen
 Pennsylvania State University: Edward M. Czekaj, John J. Coyle, Robert J. Scannell, James I. Tarman
 Pittsburgh, University of: Edward E. Bozik, Sandy Bullman, Walter P. Cummins, Caryl M. Kline, Casimir J. Myslinski, Herbert S. Smith
 Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown: Edward Sherlock, George R. Walter
 Plattsburgh, State University College: Joseph C. Jastrab
 Princeton University: Royce N. Flippin Jr.

Queens College: Cal Papatsos, Robert J. Tierney
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte, Richard Lyon
 Rochester, University of: David R. Ocorr
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis A. Alexander Jr.
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Edward J. Bloustein, Frederick E. Gruninger, Donald Heilman, Malcolm G. McLaren
 St. Bonaventure University: Lawrence Weise
 St. Francis College (N.Y.): Carlo Tramontozzi
 St. Francis College (Pa.): I. Vincent Davis
 St. John's University: John W. Kaiser
 St. Joseph's College: Rev. Michael J. Blee
 St. Lawrence University: Robert J. Sheldon
 St. Peter's College: John B. Wilson
 Scranton, University of: Gary Wodder
 Seton Hall University: Msgr. Thomas G. Fahy, Edward H. Hammond, Thomas A. Murphy, Richard J. Regan
 Shippensburg State College: John Hubley
 Slippery Rock State College: Gene L. Boyer
 Southampton College: James Colclough
 Stony Brook, State University of New York: Richard Smoliak
 Swarthmore College: Willis J. Stetson
 Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, Lester H. Dye
 Temple University: Ernest C. Casale
 Thiel College: James L. McCullough
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Capt. William T. Lai
 U.S. Military Academy: Col. William J. Schuder, Brig. Gen. Frederick A. Smith Jr.
 U.S. Naval Academy: Carl F. Ullrich
 Union College: R. Bruce Allison
 Ursinus College: Everett M. Bailey
 Villanova University: Ted Aceto, Arthur L. Mahan
 Wagner College: Larry Geraciotti
 West Chester State College: Robert W. Reese
 West Virginia University: Leland Byrd, Joseph Newhouse
 Widener College: George Hansell
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason
 York College (N.Y.): Stuart Bailin

District Three

Alabama, University of: Sam D. Bailey, Jeff Coleman, Charley Scott, Richard Thigpen
 Alabama A&M University: Joseph E. Kent
 Alabama State University: Tommy L. Frederick
 Albany State College: Wilburn A. Campbell Jr.
 Appalachian State University: C. H. Gilstrap, James F. Jones, Herbert W. Wey
 Armstrong State College: Henry L. Ashmore
 Auburn University: W. S. Bailey, Lee R. Hayley, Harry M. Philpott
 Austin Peay State University: George Fisher
 Baptist College: Howard Bagwell, James Barrier, H. Clyde Odom
 Biscayne College: Al Twitchell
 Bowie State College: A. C. Jordan
 Bridgewater College: James A. Reedy

Catholic University: J. Brian McCall
 Citadel: John E. Burrows
 Clemson University: Ralph Floyd, H. C. McLellan, Kenneth N. Vickery
 Davidson College: Thomas A. Cartmill
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Horace L. McCool
 Duke University: Carl James, Allan Kornberg
 East Carolina University: William E. Cain, Leo W. Jenkins, C. G. Moore
 East Tennessee State University: J. Madison Brooks, Solon Gentry
 Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs
 Emory and Henry College: James R. Hughes
 Emory University: W. Clyde Partin
 Fayetteville State University: William M. Bell
 Fisk University: Herbert B. Thompson
 Florida, University of: Mandell Glicksberg, S. Ray Graves, W. Hardee McAlhaney
 Florida A&M University: Hansel E. Tookes
 Florida International University: Tom H. Wonderling
 Florida State University: Richard M. Baker, John Bridgers
 Florida Technological University: C. C. Miller, John Powell
 Fort Valley State College: James E. Hawkins
 Furman University: Francis W. Bonner, John West
 Gallaudet College: Wilmer Reynolds
 George Mason University: Raymond H. Spuhler
 Georgia, University of: Vince Dooley, Joel Eaves, Reid Parker
 Georgia Institute of Technology: John McKenna, John H. O'Neill Jr., Joseph M. Pettit, William M. Sangster
 Georgia Southern College: George A. Cook
 Guilford College: Herb Appenzeller
 Hampden-Sydney College: J. Stokeley Fulton
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole
 Jacksonville University: Judson B. Harris Jr.
 Johns Hopkins University: Robert H. Scott
 Kentucky, University of: Cliff Hagan, William L. Matthews Jr.
 Kentucky State University: William Exum
 Livingston University: Asa N. Green, Jim King
 Livingstone College: Fred D. Ponder
 Louisiana State University: L. R. Daniel Jr., Carl Maddox, Paul Murrill
 Loyola College: Kevin J. Kavanagh
 Lynchburg College: William H. Shellenberger
 Madison College: William Callahan, Dean Ehlers
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore: E. Richard Watts Jr.
 Maryland, University of, College Park: John E. Faber, Robert L. Gluckstern, James H. Kehoe Jr.
 Maryville College: James Jordan
 Memphis State University: Chester J. Doll, Ford Haynes, Billy J. Murphy
 Mercer University: Jack L. Pigott
 Miami, University of: Peter R. Elliott, Harry C. Mallios
 Middle Tennessee State University: Lynn Haston, Charles M. Murphy, M. G. Scarlett

Miles College: T. J. Knox
 Millsaps College: Harper Davis
 Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Elmer C. Cooper Jr., Richard E. Keye, John H. Vaught
 Mississippi College: John M. Williams
 Mississippi State University: Leo P. Jones
 Morehead State University: G. E. Moran Jr.
 Morehouse College: Arthur McAfee
 Morris Brown College: M. J. Powell Jr.
 Murray State University: Constantine W. Curris, Thomas B. Hoggan-camp, Cal Luther
 Nicholls State University: Raymond E. Didier, Vernon F. Galliano, Clifton Morvant
 Norfolk State College: William L. Archie
 North Alabama, University of: Mickey Andrews
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Gerald A. Barrett, William Cobey Jr., Homer C. Rice, Moyer G. Smith
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Larry C. Bostian, Thomas C. Turner
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: Celeste Ulrich, James R. Swiggett
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks
 North Carolina A&T State University: Calvin Irvin
 North Carolina Central University: Joseph L. Alston, James R. Butts, S. Dallas Simmons
 North Carolina State University: Robert Bryan, Willis R. Casey, Ralph E. Fadum, Frank Weedon
 Northeast Louisiana University: Bill Beall, John David Crow
 Northern Kentucky State College: Lonnie S. Davis
 Northwestern Louisiana State University: Robert A. Alost, George Doherty
 Old Dominion University: James Jarrett
 Pembroke State University: Lacey E. Gane, Raymond B. Pennington
 Pfeiffer College: Alan Patterson
 Richmond, University of: Clyde W. Biggers, Bruce Heilman
 Roanoke College: Thomas J. Martin
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Julian L. Smith
 Salisbury State College: Nelson Butler, Norman C. Crawford
 Samford University: H. Evan Zeiger
 South, University of the: Walter Bryant
 South Alabama, University of: Billy Beane, Melvin A. Lucas
 South Carolina, University of: Harold B. Hagan, William F. Putnam
 South Carolina State University: Milton Hunter, Victor E. Kerr Jr.
 South Florida, University of: Richard T. Bowers
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Patrick Kenelly, Clea E. Parker
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Roland Dale, J. Lloyd Milam
 Southwestern College: William R. Maybry
 Stetson University: John E. Johns
 Tampa, University of: Billy B. Turner
 Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: James E. Drinnon Jr., Charles M. Temple, Harold Wilkes
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Earl M. Ramer, G. Robert Wood-ruff

Tennessee, University of, Martin: Robert L. Carroll, Larry T. McGehee, Carl Seale
 Tennessee State University: George W. Cox, Howard C. Gentry, Frederick S. Humphries
 Tennessee Technological University: Bill Branch, Arliss L. Roaden, Flavious J. Smith, Don Wade
 Tougaloo College: James C. Coleman
 Towson State College: Thomas O. Meinhardt
 Troy State University: Robert E. Stewart
 Tulane University: Thomas J. Andre, Rix N. Yard
 Tuskegee Institute: Howard Davis
 Vanderbilt University: Alexander Heard, Rob Roy Purdy, G. Clayton Stapleton
 Virginia, University of: Eugene F. Corrigan, Alan Williams
 Virginia Military Institute: Richard L. Irby, Tom Joynes
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Wilson B. Bell, Stuart K. Cassell, William E. Lavery, William B. Matthews, Frank O. Moseley
 Virginia State College: William M. Bennett, Jim Bryan, Alphonso McCain
 Wake Forest University: Gene E. Hooks, John W. Sawyer, James R. Scales
 Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry
 Washington College: Edward L. Athey
 Western Carolina University: Gurney Chambers, Robert Waters
 Western Kentucky University: John D. Minton, John Oldham
 Western Maryland University: Richard Clower
 William and Mary, College of: Lawrence S. Beckhouse, Ben L. Carnevale, Thomas A. Graves Jr.

District Four

Akron, University of: Gordon K. Larson
 Albion College: Frank Joranko
 Alma College: Charles A. Gray
 Ashland College: Fred Martinelli
 Augustana College: Vince Lundeen
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Lee Tressel
 Ball State University: Raymond A. Louthen, John J. Pruis, John E. Reno, George E. Swafford
 Bowling Green State University: Carl W. Hallberg, Don A. Cunningham, James Hof, Hollis Moore, Richard A. Young
 Butler University: Joseph M. Nygaard, David Oberting, William Sylvester
 Calvin College: David Tuuk
 Case Western Reserve University: William Grice
 Central Michigan University: Harold Abel, Neil Bucklew, Ted Kjolhede, Fran Koenig, Walter Schneider, Lester H. Serier
 Central State University: Jim McKinley
 Chicago, University of: Walter L. Hass
 Chicago State University: Dorothy Richey
 Cincinnati, University of: William R. Nester, Hindman Wall
 Cleveland State University: Robert Busbey, Merle J. Levin, Walter B. Waetjen
 Dayton, University of: Dale Foster, Thomas Frericks, Alden Ray, Raymond A. Roesch

Denison University: Roy Seils
 DePaul University: Edwin J. Schillinger
 DePauw University: Robert D. Loring, Thomas A. Mont
 Eastern Illinois University: Mike Mullally
 Eastern Michigan University: James H. Brickley, Carole J. Huston, George Linn, Albert E. Smith
 Evansville, University of: Ralph H. Coleman
 Ferris State College: H. Don Peterson
 Grand Valley State College: Donald E. Dufek
 Hope College: Gordon M. Brewer
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: Cecil N. Coleman, W. A. Ferguson, Karol Kahrs, Jack W. Peltason, Richard P. Tamburo
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Edward L. Deam, William Roetzheim, Walter G. Versen
 Illinois State University: Gene A. Budig, Twyman Jones, James L. McBee Jr., Warren H. P. Schmakel
 Indiana Central University: William A. Bright, Robert M. Brooker
 Indiana State University, Terre Haute: Jerry Huntsman, John Jessell, Richard G. Landini
 Indiana University: Chris C. Dal Sasso, Leanne Grotke, Bob Hicks, Dan W. Miller, J. William Orwig
 Iowa, University of: Chalmers W. Elliott, William Munn
 John Carroll University: John D. Keshock
 Kalamazoo College: Rolla Anderson
 Kent State University: Walter Bruska, Milo R. Lude, Glenn Olds, Gerald E. Ridinger
 Kenyon College: Tom McHugh, John Ward
 Lake Forest College: Michael E. Dau
 Lake Superior State College: Ronald R. Cooper
 Lawrence University: Ronald D. Roberts
 Loyola University: George Ireland
 Marietta College: Joe W. McDaniel
 Marquette University: William G. Murphy
 Marshall University: Olen E. Jones Jr., Joseph H. McMullen, Harold L. Willey
 Miami University: Charles Heimsch, Richard G. Shrider, Phillip R. Shriver
 Michigan, University of: Donald B. Canham, Don Lund, Marcus L. Plant
 Michigan State University: John A. Fuzak, John Shingleton, Clifton R. Wharton Jr.
 Michigan Technological University: Ross Johnson, Ted Kearly
 Millikin University: Merle Chapman, Lester B. Mathieson
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Ralph A. Romano
 Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis: Robert J. Geary, Paul R. Giel, Merle Loken, M.D., John S. Nichols
 Monmouth College: Jack M. Steger
 Moorhead State University: Ross Fortier
 Mount Union College: Jackson W. Rafeld
 Muskingum College: Edgar A. Sherman
 North Central College: Allen B. Carius
 North Park College: E. J. Kennedy

Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Richard Nelson,
Albert R. Pender
Northern Michigan University: Gil Canale, Thomas Knauss, R.
Thomas Peters
Northwestern University: Joanne A. Fortunate, Robert H. Kurz,
Laurence H. Nobles, John Pont
Notre Dame, University of: Rev. Edmund Joyce, Edward W. Krause,
Jack Stephens
Oakland University: Glenn A. Jackson, Corey Van Fleet
Oberlin College: Joe Gurtis, Larry D. Shinn
Ohio Northern University: Marvin V. English
Ohio State University: Harold L. Enarson, Hugh Hindman, Roy A.
Larmee
Ohio University: Fred Picard, Charles Ping, William D. Rohr
Ohio Wesleyan University: Robert M. Strimer
Otterbein College: Robert Agler
Principia College: James B. Crafton
Purdue University: George S. King Jr., Carol S. Mertler, Roy L.
Whistler
St. Cloud State University: Mike Simpson
St. Joseph's College: William L. Downard, Richard F. Scharf
St. Norbert College: Mel J. Nicks
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Rosemarie Archangel,
Robert Guelker, Ronald Secoy, Gerry Stormer
Toledo, University of: Glen R. Driscoll, Edwin L. Saxer, Vernon M.
Smith, Charles Snyder
Valparaiso University: Norman R. Amundsen, Richard P. Koenig
Wabash College: Robert L. Henry
Wayne State University: Chalmer G. Hixson, Joel G. Mason
Western Illinois University: Bruce H. Carpenter, Leslie F. Malpass,
James E. McKinney, Gil Peterson
Western Michigan University: Joseph T. Hoy, Leo Vander Beek
Wheaton College: Harvey C. Chrouser, Jack Swartz
Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Nancy Sell
Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse: E. William Vickroy
Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Elroy Hirsch, Otto Breitenbach,
Frank J. Remington
Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Jim Harding, Ernest Spaights,
A. Trotter, C. D. Trotter
Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: James Flood
Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Wayne Dannehl
Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Forrest Perkins, David Stone-
man
Wittenberg University: Everett H. Bush
Wooster, College of: Robert M. Bruce
Wright State University: Donald J. Mohr, O. Edward Pollock, Gor-
don L. Wise
Xavier University: James J. McCafferty, Roderick Shearer
Youngstown State University: Paul Amodio

District Five

Augustana College: Ralph Starenko
Bradley University: Orville Nothdurft, Charles Orsborn

Cameron University: John Linville
Central College: Donald T. Butler, Ronald Schipper, Kenneth Weller
Central Missouri State University: Warren C. Lovinger
Central State University: Phil Ball
Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Edwin B. Crowder
Creighton University: Rev. Michael P. Sheridan
Drake University: Robert D. Karnes
Grinnell College: John Pfitsch
Iowa State University: Jerry Barland, John P. Mahlstedt, Louis G.
McCullough
Kansas, University of: J. Hammond McNish, Clyde Walker
Kansas State University: DeLoss Dodds, Bradley L. Rothermal,
Robert R. Snell
Lincoln University: James Frank, Dwight T. Reed
Louisville, University of: Carl Abner, Dave Hart
Luther College: Edsel Schweizer, Bruce Willis
Mankato State University: Douglas R. Moore, James R. Otto
Missouri, University of, Columbia: Henry T. Lowe, Herbert W.
Schooling, Mel R. Sheehan, Candy C. Young
Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Lawrence D. Friedman, Ruth S.
Jones, Charles Smith
Morningside College: Lowell A. Brockman
Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Keith L. Broman, Don Bryant
Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Don Leahy, Robert McCune
Nebraska Wesleyan University: Arthur C. Nicolai
New Mexico State University: Keith Colson, Carl R. Hall
North Dakota, University of: Leonard R. Marti
North Dakota State University: Laurel D. Loftsgard, A. L. Sponberg
North Texas State University: William A. Miller, Charldean Newell,
DeWitt T. Weaver
Northeast Missouri State University: Kenneth L. Gardner
Northern Iowa, University of: R. C. Johnson, John Kamerick, Wilhel-
mina McFee, Raymond J. Schlicher, Stan Sheriff
Northwest Missouri State University: Mike Hunter
Oklahoma, University of: David Swank, Wade H. Walker
Oklahoma State University: Raymond E. Chapel, Floyd Gass
Oral Roberts University: Robert T. Brooks, Bob Vanatta
St. Louis University: Lawrence K. Albus, Gerard A. Fowler
Simpson College: Larry E. Johnson
South Dakota, University of: Wayne W. Gutzman, Joe Massa, Carl
R. Miller
South Dakota State University: Sherwood O. Berg, Stanley J. Mar-
shall
Southeast Missouri State University: Robert Leestamper, A. R. Mey-
er, John Schneider
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: W. D. Klimstra, Jerry
Lacey, Douglas W. Weaver
Southwest Missouri State University: R. K. Gilmore, Aldo A. Sebben
Tulsa, University of: John Dratz, F. A. Dry
Wartburg College: John F. Kurtz
Washington University: Lynn C. Imergoot, Donald E. McCright,
Bruce Melin

West Texas State University: Gene Mayfield, Lloyd I. Watkins
Wichita State University: Ted C. Bredehoft, Robert M. Holmer

District Six

Alcorn State University: James A. Brooks, Marino H. Casem, Norris Allen Edney
Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: Frank Broyles, Fred Vescolani, Albert M. Witte
Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Happy Mahfouz
Arkansas, University of, Pine Bluff: Lennis V. Coleman, Herman B. Smith Jr.
Arkansas State University: R. Dean Pryor, Ross Pritchard
Baylor University: Edwin P. Horner, Jack Patterson
Bishop College: Shannon D. Little
Centenary College: David Thomas
Grambling State University: Virden Evans, Collie J. Nicholson, Edward G. Robinson
Hardin-Simmons University: Russell Berry
Houston, University of: Harry H. Fouke, A. A. White
Houston Baptist University: Ed S. Billings, William B. Crittenden
Jackson State University: Tellis B. Ellis, Walter Reed
Lamar University: Ed Eveland, James B. Higgins
Louisiana Tech University: Harold J. Smolinski
McNeese State University: Jack V. Doland, Thomas S. Leary, Charley W. Sparks
Mississippi Valley State University: Ernest A. Boykins, Silas Peyton, Davis Weathersby
Pan American University: John W. Hook, Abe E. Lemons
Prairie View A&M University: Hoover J. Wright
Rice University: A. M. Bale, James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman
Southern Methodist University: Jim Brock, Mike Harvey
Southern University: U. S. Jones Sr.
Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Gerard St. Martin, Toby Warren
Texas, University of, Arlington: Emory D. Estes, Claude R. Gilstrap, William E. Reeves
Texas, University of, Austin: Robert C. Jeffrey, Darrell Royal, J. Neils Thompson
Texas A&M University: Emory Bellard, Wallace W. Groff, Charles H. Samson Jr.
Texas Christian University: Kenneth Herrick, James Moudy, Frank Windegger
Texas Southern University: Roderick Paige
Texas Tech University: Glenn E. Barnett, John Cobb, R. C. Jackson, J. T. King, Polk K. Robison
Trinity University: Bob McKinley

District Seven

Arizona, University of: Louis A. Myers, David Strack
Arizona State University: V. Alonzo Metcalf, Fred L. Miller, John Schwada
Boise State University: John B. Barnes, Norman Dahm, Lyle H. Smith
Brigham Young University: Milton F. Hartvigsen, Stanley H. Watts
Colorado College: Jerry Carle

Colorado School of Mines: John A. Hogan, Marvin L. Kay
Colorado State University: C. W. Hotchkiss, Jack O'Leary, Harry E. Troxell
Denver, University of: Walter O. Fischer, Ron Oyer
Gonzaga University: Larry Koentopp
Idaho, University of: Roland O. Byers, Leon G. Green, Ernest W. Hartung
Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Milton W. Holt, Charles H. Kegel
Montana, University of: Richard C. Bowers, Charles Bryan, Harley Lewis
Montana State University: Edward L. Hanson, Tom Parac
New Mexico, University of: Jose E. Martinez, Lavon McDonald, Ike Singer
Northern Arizona University: T. Hank Anderson, Lyle Mullens, J. Lawrence Walkup
Northern Colorado University: Richard R. Bond, Donald Chaloupka, Joe Lindahl
Regis College: Clarence H. Kellogg
Texas, University of, El Paso: Jim Bowden, Richard W. Burns
U.S. Air Force Academy: Jim Bowman, Col. John J. Clune, Col. Philip J. Erdle, Col. Frank Merritt
Utah, University of: James R. Jack, R. J. Snow, Robert W. Swenson
Utah State University: Ladell Andersen, Norman B. Jones
Weber State College: Joseph Bishop, Dale L. Gardner, Milton C. Mecham
Wyoming, University of: Joseph Geraud, George C. McCarty, William J. Young

District Eight

Bakersfield, California State College: Rudy Carvajal, Richard W. Graves, George B. Hibbard
California, University of, Berkeley: David L. Maggard, Robert F. Steidel Jr.
California, University of, Davis: Hubert Heitman, Joe L. Singleton
California, University of, Irvine: Daniel G. Aldrich Jr., Raymond H. Thornton
California, University of, Los Angeles: Thomas L. Jacobs, J. D. Morgan, Charles E. Young
California, University of, Riverside: Frank T. Bingham, Franklin A. Lindeburg, James Milliron
California, University of, Santa Barbara: Stephen Goodspeed, Albert E. Negratti
California Lutheran College: David H. Johnson
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Victor A. Buccola, Fred L. Clogston, Carl C. Cummins
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Barry Knight, Donald Warhurst
Claremont Men's-Harvey Mudd Colleges: Bill Arce
Fresno, California State University: J. Gene Bourdet, Norman Baxter, John Dackawich
Fullerton, California State University: Andrew F. Montana, Neale Stoner
Hawaii, University of: Edward F. Chui

Hayward, California State University: George H. Peterson
 Humboldt State University: Donald G. Clancy
 Long Beach, California State University: Frank Bowman, Perry C. Moore, Stephen Horn, Frances Schaafsma, John W. Shainline
 Los Angeles, California State University: Charles Clark, John Herman, Albert Marino, William E. Wilgus
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Bill Ireland
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Richard M. Trachok
 Northridge, California State University: Glenn W. Arnett, Sam Winningham
 Oregon, University of: Wendell M. Basye, Ray Hawk, Pete Wingert
 Oregon College of Education: Robert C. Livingston
 Oregon State University: Dee G. Andros, John R. Davis, Robert MacVicar
 Pacific, University of the: Edward S. Betz, Cedric W. Dempsey, Stanley E. McCaffrey
 Pepperdine University: Bob Thomas
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan
 Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel
 Portland State University: Scott Durdan, Roy L. Love
 Sacramento, California State University: J. Michael Bossert, Stanley V. Wright
 St. Mary's College: Bro. Mel Anderson, Don J. McKillip
 San Diego State University: O. Kenneth Karr, James G. Malik
 San Francisco, University of: Philip Callaghan
 San Francisco State University: Vic Rowen
 San Jose State University: Stan Burnham, John Caine, Richard Post
 Santa Clara, University of: G. Pat Malley
 Seattle Pacific College: Wesley E. Lingren
 Southern California, University of: E. John Larsen, Richard H. Perry
 Stanford University: John W. Harbaugh, Richard W. Lyman, Joseph H. Ruetz
 Washington, University of: Harry M. Cross, Joseph L. Kearney
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Ray Nagel, Glenn Terrell

Associate Members

Indiana University-Purdue University (Indianapolis): Nicholas Kellum, Hugh A. Wolf
 Ramapo College: Robert N. Hartman
 Texas, University of, Dallas: Robert Knight

Allied Members

Atlantic Coast Conference: Robert C. James
 Big Eight Conference: Charles M. Neinas, Richard D. Martin, Jack McClelland
 Big Sky Conference: John O. Roning
 Big Ten Conference: Wayne Duke, John D. Dewey, C. D. Henry
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Lew Comer
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: L. D. Smith
 East Coast Conference: Ernest C. Casale
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Robert M. Whitelaw, George R. Bisacca, Clayton W. Chapman

Far Western Conference: Ervin C. Delman
 Gulf South Conference: Stanley Galloway
 Indiana Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
 Ivy Group: James Litvack
 Mason-Dixon Conference: Emil G. Reitz Jr.
 Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Lawrence K. Albus
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Albert L. Deal
 Mid-American Conference: Fred Jacoby
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: James W. Younge
 Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Willis J. Stetson
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ron Roberts
 Missouri Valley Conference: A. M. Holmes
 New Jersey State College Athletic Conference: William P. Dioguardi
 North Central Conference: Richard G. Koppenhaver
 Ohio Valley Conference: Paul F. Dietzel
 Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Jesse T. Hill
 Pacific-8 Conference: Wiles Hallock
 South Atlantic Conference: J. B. Searce
 Southeastern Conference: H. Boyd McWhorter, Elmore Hudgins, C. W. Ingram
 Southern Conference: Kenneth G. Germann
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: George H. Hobson
 Southland Conference: Dick Oliver
 Southwest Athletic Conference: Cliff Speegle, Hal Lahar
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: Andrew Brown
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Daniel T. Mullin
 West Coast Athletic Conference: Robert A. Sunderland
 Western Athletic Conference: Stan Bates
 Western Collegiate Hockey Association: J. Burt Smith
 Yankee Conference: Andrew Mooradian

Affiliated Members

American Hockey Coaches Association: Lufay Anderson Sweet II
 College Athletic Business Managers Association: William H. Aspinwall
 Golf Coaches Association of America: Richard Gordin
 Intercollegiate Soccer Association of America: Hank Eichen
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: Joseph R. Vancisin
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary
 National Athletic Steering Committee: Vannette W. Johnson
 National Fencing Coaches Association of America: Leslie F. Bleamaster II, Henry Harutunian, A. John Geraci, Manyhert Kadar, Alfred R. Peredo
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: James L. McDowell Jr.
 National Soccer Coaches Association: Frederick W. Taube
 National Wrestling Coaches Association: Marvin Hess, Rummy Macias
 State of Louisiana Board of Education: Gordon F. Lory, J. Y. Foreman, J. Curtis Joubert, Irwin A. Sibille, B. M. Woodard, M.D.
 U.S. Cross Country Coaches Association: Jack W. Rose
 U.S. Track Coaches Association: Sam Bell, Herman Wilson

Visitors

Amateur Basketball Association of the U.S.A.: William L. Wall
Astro Blue Bonnet Bowl: John M. Mettenheimer
C. D. Chesley Company: C. D. Chesley, W. C. McIlvain Jr.
Gator Bowl Association: John Lanahan, George R. Olson
Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley, T. J. Foley Jr.
Orange Bowl: Jim Armstrong, Gene Autrey, Ben Benjamin
Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association: Bob Cheney, Stan Hahn,
Bill Nicholas, Fred W. Soldwedec, Art Welsh
President's Commission on Olympic Sports: Malcolm Bund, Michael
T. Harrigan, Jane Lipton, Jack McCahill, William F. Waslick
Robert Morris College: Ken Mease
Rose, David A.
Spencer Marketing Services: Herb Machol
Sugar Bowl: Capt. Joe T. Katz, Clifford H. Kern Jr.

Working News Media

ABC Sports: Donn Bernstein
Associated Press: Paul LeBar, Herschel Nissenson
Birmingham News: Alf Van Hoose
Chicago Tribune: Bill Jauss
Chronicle of Higher Education: Larry Van Dyne
Dallas Times-Herald: Bob Galt
Des Moines Register: Buck Turnbull
Detroit Free Press: Charlie Vincent
Jackson Clarion-Ledger: John Stamm
Jonesboro Sun: Jim Graves
KMOX-TV: Gary Bender
Kansas City Star: Bill Sims
Knoxville News-Sentinel: Tom Siler
Lansing Journal: Fred Stabley Jr.
Lincoln Journal: Virgil Parker
Lincoln Star: Bob Owens
Memphis Commercial-Appeal: Bobby Hall
Memphis Press-Scimitar: George Lapides
Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
Nashville Tennessean: Jeff Hanna
New York Times: Gordon White
Newsday: Dan Lauck
Oklahoma City Daily Oklahoman: Bob Hurt
Philadelphia Daily News: Tom Cushman
Philadelphia Inquirer: Frank Dolson
St. Louis Globe-Democrat: Dave Gaumer, Jack Herman
St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Bill Beck, Bob Broeg
Sporting News: Joe Marcin
Sports Illustrated: Larry Keith
Topeka Daily Capital: Ken Laiker
Tulsa Tribune: Bob Hartzell
Tupelo Journal: Bill Ross

Tuscaloosa News: Mike McKenzie
UCLA Daily Bruin: Mark Dellins
United Press International: Laszlo Domjan, Tracy Ringolsby
University Daily Kansan: Ken Stone
Washington Post: Paul Attner
Wichita Eagle: Charlie Smith

THIRD SPECIAL CONVENTION

OPENING SESSION

Wednesday Afternoon, January 14, 1976

The Third Special Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 1 p.m. by NCAA President John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University, in the Mississippi-Missouri-Illinois Rooms of Stouffer's Riverfront Inn, St. Louis, Missouri.

1. OPENING REMARKS

President Fuzak: The Convention will please come to order. It is my privilege as your President to welcome you to the Third Special Convention of the NCAA. Preliminarily, I have a few announcements. First of all, I should like to introduce the people who are here at the head table with me.

We have our parliamentarian, Alan Chapman, immediate past President of the NCAA; Stan Marshall, Secretary-Treasurer of the NCAA, and Ted Tow, director of the NCAA Publishing Service and recording secretary of the NCAA Council.

The chairman of the Voting Committee is Aldo Sebben, and he has asked the members of the Voting Committee to report to him.

At the outset of this Convention, it seems appropriate to review briefly the background of this meeting. The 69th NCAA Convention last January mandated the Association to hold a special meeting on economy and intercollegiate athletics. This meeting was held in April in Kansas City. From that meeting came the call for the Second Special Convention which was held in Chicago in August. The agenda for this Convention in August was specifically limited to proposals which could effect economies in athletics. As you know that Convention was unable to complete its business.

The delegates in August voted to adjourn that meeting and carry over all of the tabled, postponed and unconsidered proposals to this Third Special Convention. Therefore, the 79 proposals before us in this meeting are the economy issues carried from the August Convention, including those few additional amendments to amendments submitted in accordance with the November 1 deadline. No additional amendments to amendments by voting members are permitted for this Special Convention.

There are a few comments which need to be made at this time regarding the Convention procedure. First, I should remind you that many of the procedures, including the order of business and review of our voting procedures, are included in the Official Notice of this Convention.

2. EXPLANATION OF VOTING PROCEDURES

President Fuzak: Let me review briefly the voting and speaking privileges for the NCAA Convention. Each active member may have three accredited delegates, one voting and two alternates. They also may have visiting delegates, if they wish; but only the voting

or alternate delegates may speak in the business session.

Allied conferences have the same voting and speaking rights as the active members, one voting delegate, two alternates and visiting delegates, who do not take part in these proceedings. An allied conference, which does not have the right to vote, and any affiliated member organization may have one official delegate who is permitted to speak but not to vote. In these cases, we ask that these individuals identify themselves and their affiliation when they desire to speak. We have established a visitors section this year, and we are asking all visiting delegates from non-voting members to sit in that area. This would be those delegates with a pink badge for non-voting members.

We are aware that some visiting delegates or voting members are involved directly within their institutions legislative deliberations, but other visitors from other members are asked to occupy the section for visitors.

Some of the affiliated member delegates with pink badges do have special privileges. Those affiliated delegates are permitted to go to the microphone, be recognized and speak. Otherwise, visiting delegates are here as observers and may not take part, active part, in the proceedings. The purpose of this special visitors section is to keep the Convention floor as orderly as possible, to enable the voting and alternate delegates to transact their business in an efficient manner and to help the chair in determining the paddle votes.

Finally, a couple of important comments about the 70th Annual Convention which will begin tomorrow. Please note that the deadline for amendments to amendments for the 70th Convention is 1 p.m. tomorrow. Amendments to amendments must be submitted on the special amendment to amendment form this year. You were notified of this in the mailing from the national office last fall.

All amendments to amendments should be returned to the headquarters suite before 1 p.m. tomorrow.

It is our understanding that a number of sponsors intend to withdraw their proposals for the 70th Convention. In a move to help expedite the business of that Convention, the Council is urging those who wish to withdraw amendments to notify the NCAA staff in advance of the business session.

The chair will announce such withdrawals, saving the time that it will take the sponsor to get to a microphone.

All votes will be by paddle and the chair will attempt to make a visual determination of the passage or failure. If there is any doubt, the Voting Committee will be asked to take a count. Any voting delegate may call for a division of the delegate questions if the delegate questions have visual determination. On issues voted by the separate NCAA divisions, the result of the vote will not be announced until the voting is completed in each of the divisions voting. The voting by divisions will alternate in the order in which the vote is taken so we will at times start with Division III and other times it will be Division I and other times it will be Division II.

We now are ready to undertake the issues that are before us at the last Special Convention. First before us will be a number of tabled proposals.

3. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Financial Aid

Mike Mullally (Eastern Illinois University): Eastern Illinois University would like to withdraw No. 1.

President Fuzak: Is there any objection? I guess it is unnecessary to withdraw. All you need to do is leave it on the table so that we will save time through that process. If no one desires to remove it from the table, then it will remain there. I guess that is a more positive approach than withdrawing it.

[Proposals Nos. 1 and 2 (pages A-1-2) were not removed from the table.]

Campus Visitation

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the Council, I should like to move that No. 3 and the attendant amendments be removed from the table.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Fuzak: It has been moved and seconded to remove No. 3, and once it is removed from the table the amendments to amendments related to it automatically are taken up. The motion has been made to remove it from the table.

[The motion to remove No. 3 from the table was approved.]

Jack Larsen (University of Southern California): On behalf of the Pacific-8 Conference, I move the adoption of No. 4.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Pacific-8 Conference believes that setting a starting date limit on the visitation privileges works an undue restraint which is not necessarily given the flexibility desired by individual institutions.

[Proposal No. 4 (page A-3) was approved by Division I; defeated by Division II, 39-64, and by Division III.]

Mr. Thompson: On behalf of the Council, I should like to move the adoption of No. 5 which, in effect, changes the dates for football. I will have to say this differently for the divisions. For Division I, no beginning date to the third Saturday in February; and insofar as the other divisions the original motion prevails, and then the third Saturday.

[The motion was seconded.]

Let me say in regard to this amendment, and subsequent legislation that may or may not come before this Convention, the third Saturday in February, insofar as football is concerned, is more compatible with that legislation than the time originally stipulated in the amendment.

Robert Latour (Bucknell University): A point of information, please. The schools in Division I and Division II in football, will they vote in Division II on this amendment?

President Fuzak: Yes. We have some people who are not Division I in football. Your point is well taken. The parliamentarian suggests the voting be by football division.

[Proposal No. 5 (page A-3) was approved by Division I; defeated by Division II, 61-66, and by Division III.]

Carl Miller (University of South Dakota): Can we bring up Proposal No. 4 for reconsideration? There was confusion in the voting.

President Fuzak: It is proper to bring the matter up and get a vote for reconsideration by Division II.

Mr. Miller: I so move.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

Charley Scott (University of Alabama): In August, I raised the question about this particular amendment, as to whether there was any economy to be effected by that amendment. Approximately 30 minutes later the Convention agreed with me. I believe that the same statements apply to this particular amendment. You have set a number of visitations as a limit in various sports. It seems to me that squeezing that into a restrictive period of time does not effect any economies.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): I want to speak with Alabama in this, but raise other issues also. As the program sets out here, the economy meeting could not make a recommendation on this, so this really did not come from the committee dealing with that.

I also think we should look at what saddles our coaches and our athletic departments with innumerable regulations that have absolutely no benefits. I think this is one of them. I would urge that we defeat this because it doesn't economize. All it does is clutter the books.

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): I can add nothing to the previous statements but to say in the month of December and January a number of our institutions are closed for extensive periods for reason of energy conservation. In addition to economy reasons, the limitation on the number who can visit in each sport, the limitation on the total number on all sports and a limitation to the candidates, the number of schools they can visit, this legislation seems completely unnecessary.

[Proposal No. 3 (page A-2) was defeated by Divisions II and III and by Division I as amended by No. 4 and 5.]

Recruiting Aids

Cecil Coleman (University of Illinois): I move Proposal No. 6 be taken from the table.

[The motion was seconded and defeated. Proposal No. 7 (page A-4) was ruled out of order as an amendment to No. 6 Proposal No. 8 (page A-4) was not removed from the table.]

Coaching Staffs

Mr. Coleman: I move to take Proposal No. 9 from the table.

[The motion was seconded and defeated. Proposals Nos. 10-18 (pages A-6-9) remained on the table with No. 9 (page A-5) which they were amending.]

[Proposal No. 19 (page A-9) was withdrawn, and Proposals Nos. 20-24 (pages A-13-16) were ruled out of order due to the withdrawal of No. 19.]

Limitations on Scouting

James Higgins (Lamar University): On behalf of the Council I move adoption of Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

Andy Geiger (University of Pennsylvania): I move the adoption of amendment No. 26, as an amendment to No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think it is fairly clear. The amendment modifies Proposal No.

25 to permit one scouting opportunity for which expenses are paid in each sport for each opponent on the schedule. I feel in team sports that scouting is an aid to the student who participates in our programs. It is a part of athletics. I think that it is wrong to cut it out entirely.

[Proposal No. 26 (page A-17) was defeated by all three divisions.]

Mr. Swank: I move Proposal No. 27 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

To be very brief on this, in the limitations as far as counting is concerned, we see no reason why the NCAA should be interested in limiting that within a conference. It should be left up to conferences how they wish to run their own programs, their scouting. This would allow them to make that decision.

[Proposal No. 27 (page A-18) was defeated by all three divisions.]

H. Boyd McWhorter (Southeastern Conference): I would like to move No. 28.

[The motion was seconded; and Proposal No. 28 (page A-18) was defeated by Division I football, 56-76, and by Division II and Division III football.]

President Fuzak: We are back to the main motion.

[Proposal No. 25 (page A-17) was approved by Division I, 109-103 (121-105 on recount); defeated by Division II, 47-64, and by Division III.]

Mike Mullally (Eastern Illinois University): I would like to ask we reconsider our vote in Division II. We are interested in effecting economies, and this would bring it about. Since Division I has passed, I think we ought to reconsider it in Division II.

[Motion to reconsider in Division II was seconded and defeated, 51-59.]

Edmund Joyce (Notre Dame University): Would it be possible to ask for reconsideration of Proposal No. 28? I think perhaps some that voted against No. 28 possibly felt that No. 25 would fail. In other words, they were hopeful this whole group of rulings would go down the drain. Now, that No. 25 has passed, that eliminates any scouting at all in football. A very curious thing takes place in this because the vote on No. 28, which failed, was 76-56, which meant that 132 schools voted.

Presumably, those were just football teams. Now, what has happened in No. 25, in the total count in Division I, 226 schools voted which meant almost 100 schools voted for that particular amendment that didn't have football teams or weren't concerned with football. Yet they have had enough strength to carry this and eliminate all scouting in football. I think it seems a little unfair that we are permitting scouting in basketball and not even one game to be scouted in football. For that reason, I should like to know if we can reconsider voting on No. 28 and make it possible to scout one game in football?

President Fuzak: The parliamentarian and I would like to discuss this. We differ in view. Just a moment. I am going to rule that you may accomplish what you seek by moving for reconsideration of No. 28 in Division No. I.

Rev. Joyce: I do move reconsideration of No. 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

I suppose I also should request that those who do not have football be refrained from voting even though they may be in Division I.

[The motion was defeated, 60-74.]

Preseason Practice

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): On behalf of the Council, I move No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the first in the Council's sponsored package of amendments which would define and limit the practice and playing seasons in all NCAA sports. It is only restricted at the present time in football and basketball. No. 36 is limiting the length of the playing season, and No. 43 is limiting the number of playing dates within that season.

Nos. 57, 140 and 141 are proposals which were developed and recommended to the Council by the Special Committee on Length of Season. The Council made some modifications to the committee's recommendations. The Council appointed this committee and directed it to survey the membership regarding the length of season, the number of contests, the size of squads and other related factors.

The committee was directed to recommend appropriate restrictions in these different areas for two primary purposes. The first, the economy, and the second, patrol the student-athlete to bolster his sport even with the advantages of the coaches or his own volition. No. 29, then, would specifically limit preseason practice in all sports. It makes no change in the special relation on preseason football practice and recommends that basketball preseason practice begin November 1 rather than October 15. It establishes variable starting dates for all other sports. This primarily was based on the information developed by the length of season survey conducted by the membership.

Roy Whistler (Purdue University): I would like to call your attention to Nos. 30 and 31. When Purdue University sent in a list, it sent in the three items you see under No. 30, plus the items which you see under No. 31, golf, tennis, indoor track and outdoor track. But since Adelphi had submitted the list you see under No. 31, our list was split; and the items I have mentioned were included with Adelphi. The three that were not included were separated under No. 30. We would like, if it is permissible, to withdraw basketball but leave baseball and swimming so they would then become a part of No. 31 and be an addition to that group.

Therefore, we ask the chair's permission to withdraw from No. 30 just the item, Basketball.

President Fuzak: You have that permission since it is out of order anyway. [Laughter] I would rather not explain that, but permission is granted. Basketball will be withdrawn from that.

Mr. Whistler (Purdue University): Therefore, I move No. 30, with Basketball being withdrawn, be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

Kenneth Germann (Southern Conference): Does this mean if we adopt No. 30, there will be no preseason practice allowed in baseball and swimming?

President Fuzak: It eliminates the starting date. It is the exact opposite, in fact, unless the Purdue representative wishes to do so. It returns it to the present practice or rule, the current situation.

[Proposal No. 30 (page A-20) was defeated by all three divisions.]

William Roetzheim (University of Illinois, Chicago Circle): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

Our institution submitted a fragment of this amendment, and we support the whole amendment. I have been asked by the National Gymnastics Association to speak to that segment which we support very strongly. In our particular institution, our gymnastics facility is approximately a \$250,000 investment. Unlike many sports where the student body will come in and participate in the facility, in gymnastics, because of the very liability of the sport, you cannot do this. It would mean closing this particular facility for a good part of the year. You can't have the student body just coming to a facility and participating in gymnastics unless you have a very competent individual in that particular area. In this case, it would be the coach.

I also question the economy of this particular matter. It seems to me when you start all particular sports or all starting dates in a particular sport on the same date, then the individual with the most grants-in-aid is always going to dominate it. This way, if the coach wants to put in additional time to develop a great program without additional grants-in-aid, he still can become successful.

William Exum (Kentucky State University): I am talking in behalf of the Track Coaches Association. I believe this proposal, as it is here, is inaccurate. The rest of the world is competing with these athletes in all these sports practically year around. I see no reason why we should continuously hamper our USA athletes in behalf of some nebulous savings of money. I seriously doubt that there is any money being saved on this proposition. I urge all of you to vote for this Proposal No. 31.

[Proposal No. 31 (page A-20) was approved by Divisions I and II and defeated by Division III, 37-75.]

Richard Post (San Jose State University): In view of the considerations in the last vote, I should like to move that Proposal No. 29 be tabled.

[The motion was seconded and Proposal No. 29 and its amendments Nos. 32-35 (page A-18-21) were tabled.]

Playing Seasons

Fred Jacoby (Mid-American Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the second in a package of four Council sponsored amendments limiting length of season in all sports. Frank Lindeburg explained the rationale and background for those proposals when he introduced No. 29, so there is no reason to repeat that information for you.

Proposal No. 36 limits the playing seasons in each sport by specifying the permissible date of the first contest without competition and by specifying the end of the playing season in each case. The only sports that currently have such limitations are football and basketball, and those restrictions are unchanged in this proposal. It

is, once again, based primarily on the data from the Length of Season Committee survey of the membership. In other words, these proposals reflect basically what the membership is doing now.

Lawrence Albus (St. Louis University): I move to amend Proposal No. 36 with No. 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

Since many of the institutions in the Midwest participate primarily in weekend service, rather than specifying a particular date which could well be in the middle of a week, this would allow the season competition to begin on a weekend.

Fred Miller (Arizona State University): I move to table Proposal No. 36.

[The motion was seconded and No. 36 (page A-21) and the amendments to it (Nos. 37-42, pages A-23-24) were tabled.]

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): I rise for a point of order to ask a question. When proposals are divided, it is quite possible that one division would like to pass legislation. Would it not be possible for tabled items involving all three divisions to be broken down and acted on accordingly? I should like to ask that of the parliamentarian.

President Fuzak: It could be; and I think if a motion were made in such a manner, it would be appropriate to ask for a vote by divisions in the tabling.

Mr. Lindeburg: If that is the case, I request a vote on retabling of the item that was just acted upon; and then I will come back again. This is for Division II only.

President Fuzak: I think your procedure might be for you—it is a difficult one—but it would be reconsideration of a vote just taken, and then move to take the tabling vote by divisions.

Mr. Lindeburg: Concerning No. 29, I move that the tabled vote be untabled for Division II.

President Fuzak: I am sorry. The parliamentarian straightened me out. You cannot reconsider a vote to table.

Mr. Lindeburg: Can you move to take it off the table?

President Fuzak: Yes, you can raise the question of the propriety of the vote. If it was improperly taken, you want to take it again by divisions. I think in fairness you should have this opportunity.

Mr. Lindeburg: Then, I would like the tabling vote on Proposal No. 29 for Division II to be recounted.

Fred Miller (Arizona State University): I believe it was for Division II. Does that mean it will not affect the other divisions?

President Fuzak: If we vote by tabling by divisions, we vote all three; and it seems appropriate and proper to do that, because this is a divided bylaw. I overlooked that fact, and it should have been taken on that basis.

Mr. Miller: Do you not agree that Nos. 36 and 29 follow the same pattern? They do affect all three divisions.

President Fuzak: Well, we will redo both of them, then.

Mr. Miller: I am not requesting that. I am requesting . . .

President Fuzak: If someone requests it, we will do it. We will take a revote on the basis of divisions for this particular item.

Mr. Miller: We will challenge the ruling of the chair.

[The challenge was seconded.]

President Fuzak: The motion is shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

[The ruling of the chair was sustained.]

We are back on No. 29. We are doing it by divisions.

[Proposal No. 29 was tabled by all three divisions.]

Mr. Lindeburg: Because of the recent vote taken I will not ask for a recount on the retabled motion regarding No. 36, as long as the chair continues to abide by that practice in the future.

President Fuzak: You had this one coming, Frank. [Laughter] The parliamentarian reminds me that the items that are tabled die at the end of this session. They may be taken from the table at any time during this Special Convention, but they do not continue on beyond the limits of the Special Convention. Of course, it is also open for resubmission at a later Convention.

Number of Playing Dates

Mr. Lindeburg: On behalf of the Council, I move No. 43 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the third in this length of season package as outlined earlier by Fred Jacoby and myself, and all the previous comments about it are similar. This proposal sets forth specific limitations on the length of playing season in each separate sport by limiting the number of playing dates which would be permitted within a playing season. It also establishes a number of dates in various sports, depending upon an individual sport or a team sport.

If we are going to do any economizing, I would urge each one of you not to consider the package that is before us, the large number of items, but consider the merit of each particular item that we have in front of us. This is one item that can make a restriction. This restriction started with a survey by the NCAA in about 1952, when a restriction was placed both on football and basketball. These restrictions have been modified up to the present time but have turned out to be a problem. I urge you to seriously consider eliminating the number of playing dates we have in all the sports in addition to those we have in football and basketball. I urge you to vote for this proposition.

Richard Burns (University of Texas, El Paso): I move to table No. 43 and vote by divisions.

[The motion was seconded, and No. 43 (page A-24) and amendments to it (Nos. 44-56, pages A-26-29) were tabled by Divisions I and III. Count in Division I was 125-99. Division II defeated the motion to table, 31-74.]

President Fuzak: This is before Division II. Division I and Division III can relax for a while. The amendment to No. 43 is No. 44. No. 44 is in order for Division No. II. Does someone wish to move its adoption?

Bill Arce (Claremont Men's-Harvey Mudd Colleges): I have been asked to present a position statement from the American Association of Baseball Coaches as an affiliate member. That statement has been mimeographed. For the sake of brevity, I don't intend to read that statement. I do intend to state just briefly that baseball, like several other sports, has tremendously climatic conditions placed upon it.

Legislation of this type, and legislation which we have already tabled should be taken into account by a national rule. The organi-

zation itself feels that it has a history of conferences and institutions passing legislation limiting baseball, sports like baseball, and feels that is where these types of rules should be passed. We would, therefore, urge non-tabling of Proposal No. 43.

President Fuzak: The vote was taken on tabling and it cannot be reconsidered. The option is to defeat these if you so desire. No one has yet moved Proposal No. 44. If no one moves No. 44, we will move on to No. 45. This is only for Division II. Hearing no one move adoption of 45 we will move on to Proposal No. 46.

Capt. J. O. Coppedge (U.S. Naval Academy): In the interest of order and time, would it be out of order to suggest that the Division II members consider these in their round table tomorrow morning so we can move on with the business pertinent to all three divisions?

President Fuzak: We are committed to consideration on these items, and I believe that it is appropriate to allow Division II to consider these. The particular problem with that approach, too, is that we may conclude that Special Convention today. The round table would not be of any effect. Did anyone move for No. 46? No one has moved 46 so we will move to No. 47.

Andrew Brown (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I move for a recount on No. 43 on the tabling issue.

President Fuzak: I believe that will be out of order because according to our count it was 31 yes votes, 74 no votes. A recount is out of order. I will check with the parliamentarian, though.

Mr. Brown: My reason for making that request is that all the amendments to No. 43 have been passed by Division I schools and we are only voting in Division No. II schools.

President Fuzak: They were proposed for all three divisions, however. You have the remedy in your hands. I will rule that you are out of order in demanding the recount when we had an actual count. If you moved for reconsideration, I would consider it.

Delegate: I am sorry if I have to backtrack a little bit. I was a little confused. In view of the fact you did not have someone move No. 44, on behalf of the baseball people, I would like to move No. 44 be placed before the membership.

President Fuzak: That will be for Division No. II only. Is there a second? There is no second. It dies for the lack of a second. Item No. 48 for Division No. II only. Does someone wish to move Proposal No. 48?

[No. 48 (page A-27) was moved and seconded from the floor and defeated.]

Robert Guelker (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

I might point out for the information of the membership as chairman for the NCAA Soccer Rules Committee, our 13-man committee voted unanimously for this number. They feel if the original motion would pass that this number would be more in order and 13 is an unrealistic figure. We feel, therefore, that 18 would be more in line.

[Proposal No. 49 was defeated by Division II, 29-73.]

William Exum (Kentucky State University): I move Proposal No. 51 be adopted.

President Fuzak: Is there a second? If you wish to second it, please raise your hand or paddle. It dies for the lack of a second. No. 52 is before us.

Lew Comer (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I move adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[Proposal No. 52 (page A-28) was seconded and defeated by Division II.]

President Fuzak: No. 53, for Division II, is before us. Does someone wish to move adoption of Proposal No. 53 for Division No. II? Seeing no one approaching the microphone, we will move then to Proposal No. 54. This is out of order. We will not go to Proposal No. 55, which is for Division II. Seeing no one approaching, we will go to Proposal No. 56.

Al Loomer (University of Wisconsin, Green Bay): I wish to move adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale behind the proposal is to enable teams, once they are at a tournament site, to count the tournament as one game in that most of the traveling expenses have been taken care of at that time. If this proposal is to be enacted, the money would necessarily be saved.

[Proposal No. 56 (page A-29) was defeated by Division II.]

Delegate: Mr. Chairman, may we reconsider No. 45?

President Fuzak: No one moved it so it cannot be reconsidered.

Delegate: I so move.

[Proposal No. 45 (page A-26) was seconded and defeated by Division II.]

President Fuzak: We are back to No. 43 in Division II without amendments, as it now stands.

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): There is an editorial change in Proposal No. 43. It shows basketball as 26 and the editorial change is 27. We are allowed that many basketball games at the present time. I would like to make a brief comment about this proposition.

We realize we have been successful in limiting the number of games in basketball and football. This does it for all sports for Division II in NCAA play. This helps us in economy. It helps us in the amount of time we are taking our students away from their studies by still giving them a fine athletic program.

If we pass it, it will be the first constructive approach as far as the NCAA is concerned. I ask those in Division II to approve this proposition.

Sam Bell (U. S. Track Coaches Association): On behalf of the U. S. Track Coaches Association, I would like to urge the defeat of the motion because of what it does to track and field. This country is very diverted geographically and climatically. There are many places in this country that can't conduct outdoor track until the middle of April. By limiting indoor track to nine meets, it means many of the schools that try to go ahead and compete through the indoor season have a gap of almost two months and their outdoor season is limited to approximately six weeks. There is no way they can use the 12 dates.

There was an amendment here, No. 51, that would have com-

bined the two limitations. We are not opposed to limitations in any way, but opposed to the specific limitation of nine indoor and 12 outdoor because it does an injustice to the teams in cooler areas. We feel for the teams that have only outdoor track, when you combine this with people who have both, it is a disadvantage.

We urge the defeat of the motion because No. 51 was not passed.

[Proposal No. 43 (page A-24) was defeated by Division II, 55-70.]

Out-of-Season Practice

Cecil Coleman (University of Illinois, Champaign): I move Proposal No. 57 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is the final proposal in the length of season package. This proposal would prohibit out-of-season practice in the sports of ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, volleyball and water polo and limit out-of-season practice in baseball, golf and tennis, as well as to continue the present prohibition of such practice in basketball and football. I might say the limitations in baseball, golf and tennis recognize the climatic factors affecting those sports in certain geographic regions.

Louis Myers (University of Arizona): I wonder if Proposal No. 57 is not out of order inasmuch as Proposal No. 56, which established playing seasons for those sports other than football and basketball, has been tabled. In other words, I don't think the playing seasons for these sports have been established. Therefore, how can you have out-of-season practice if you have no in-season?

President Fuzak: There is a consensus this is out of order. I must say, Cecil, you presented that very well, though. [Laughter].

[Proposals Nos. 58-60 (page A-32) became moot when No. 57 (page A-29) was ruled out of order.]

This moves us to No. 61. It is before us. No. 62 is an amendment to No. 61 and I call that to your attention. These are for Divisions II and III only.

Spring Football Practice

Robert Strimer (Ohio Wesleyan University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

You will notice in the note for both Divisions II and III it was unanimous in the economy meeting that spring football be abolished. I think no further explanation is necessary.

Shannon Little (Bishop College): My only intent in No. 62 was to enable my school, which plays nine games in Division II, to be able to, and I am a Division III team, have spring practice. Of course, if Division II doesn't have it, it will not help me anyway. That was the purpose of No. 62. In the event Division II had spring practice and Division III votes it down, most of my games are in Division II, and I am getting the devil beat out of me, I would not like to handicap myself any more. [Laughter] The proposal provides an exception procedure.

Arthur DeGenaro (Mansfield State College): I would like to make three points and a point of personal privilege. The first point is it is very apparent today this body is not interested in cost-saving measures. Secondly, from a philosophical standpoint, as a Division

III team, self determination has always been rather deep in our philosophy. If you want to project a kind of interesting view, you can get rid of spring football; and I think there are real grounds to get rid of it. But, you should not vote it out for the reason here today. It is not a cost saving effectiveness, in my opinion. If you vote it down, please don't vote it out for the wrong reason. You can make a long list of reasons why it should not be there, but this is really the meeting for cost savings until the Annual Convention starts.

I am speaking to retain football in the spring for a number of reasons. First, from a historical traditional standpoint, we were the first school in America to play the first night football game. In looking up research, we were the first school in the United States to have spring practice. In this Bicentennial year, I don't want a voluntary organization telling me when I can practice and when I can't.

President Fuzak: I must say, sir, your comments are not appropriate to the amendment which provide an exception procedure.

Mr. DeGenaro: May I speak to No. 61 when the time is right?

President Fuzak: Yes, sir. Does anyone wish to speak to No. 62? It has been brought to my attention that the speaker from Bishop College never actually moved No. 62. I had assumed that he had. Do you wish to move it, sir?

Mr. Little: I so move.

[Proposal No. 62 (page A-33) was seconded and approved by Divisions II and III.]

Mr. DeGenaro: I think when we left off I was concerned about the voluntary organization of the NCAA moving in this direction. If you let your mind wander a little bit, if one is told when they can practice and then how long, pretty soon you are going to be moving to decide what kind of offense and what kind of defense, who can play, et cetera, et cetera.

The other thing is some of you are not operating under negotiated contracts like we are in Pennsylvania. We have entered into an agreement with our staff and coaches that we put out a program, and they have agreed to teach it. Now, when a voluntary association interferes with the agreement between two parties, they are changing the conditions of employment. It puts us in quite a lot of dilemma. If this passes and is thrown out, I don't know what our position would be. I should like to conclude briefly, because I know everybody is cognizant of the time factor we are operating under. A case can be made to throw out spring football; but if you throw it out for financial reasons and without considering these things, you are really throwing the baby out with the bath water.

David Nelson (University of Delaware): Because we have legislation in the regular session concerning reorganization and a significant number of Division II schools that might be in 1-A, I think this should be tabled. Also there is consideration now in the Football Rules Committee, and a possibility there will be significant changes in the techniques of blocking and tackling, so for that reason I would hate to see anybody without spring practice this year.

Mr. Chairman, I move this be tabled.

[The motion to table Proposal No. 61 (page A-32) as amended by No. 62 was seconded and approved by Division II and de-

feated by Division III. Proposal No. 61 was approved as amended by Division III.]

Outside Participation

Fred Jacoby (Mid-American Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 65 specifies that the student-athlete shall compete on only one team in any academic year. All this is, is an extension of the season to include the academic year. Let me give you an example. Here is what may happen. Men's volleyball is a late winter and early spring sport, running from February to May 10. For women, volleyball is a fall sport.

This proposal would specify that a student-athlete may not participate on his institution's club team an extramural competition in his sport during any academic year in which he is or was a member of the institution's intercollegiate team in that sport. It also defines *academic year* for purposes of this legislation. Therefore, I urge you to give careful consideration and approve No. 65.

President Fuzak: This is a Constitutional amendment requiring a two-thirds vote.

Robert Guelker (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville): Speaking for myself, the Rules Committee and the National Soccer Coaches Association, we feel that rule should not be passed. Therefore, I would like to move for tabling the amendment.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

Ernest Casale (Temple University): I would like to speak against the motion because I don't think it is fair for some of our student-athletes not to be allowed to participate on the outside after their seasons are over. Certainly, it doesn't affect the economy at all. I think they should have the right to do that. The same thing is in baseball. I suggest we do not support this proposal.

Mr. Guelker: I would like to speak out against this proposal in behalf of the soccer players. First of all, this is not an economy measure. In my university and many universities, outside participation does not cost the university one cent. Therefore, it doesn't apply as an economy measure to us. I think I am more concerned from the standpoint of that great progress in the last decade in our country as far as soccer is concerned.

I see a rule like this being so prohibitive that it can almost be a death blow to the progress that has been made. One of the real problems is the fact that soccer has been supported. Much progress and development has been made with the American boy to make him competitive. For example, this year we played games where one team had seven freshmen, 21 or 22 years of age, that were brought in and recruited from another country. I have no objection to this. In the finals, we had a 24-year-old sophomore who was brought in. I have no objection to that. My objection is to the fact these players will play 50 to 60 games in their country before they are recruited each year.

The American boy will be very limited in the number of games he will play. If we have such a rule like this, our players would only be playing three months out of the year; and they will not get the opportunity to develop and progress by playing games which

are needed which will be very detrimental to the sport. I can see there are some rules needed for uniformity, but I don't think that uniform rules are there at the detrimental aspect of someone else or some individual or some sport.

[Proposal No. 165 (page A-34) was defeated.]

Football Playing Season

Carl James (Duke University): I move adoption of No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

For nearly three hours now we have opened the door on the non-revenue sports to allow unlimited participation play, the number of contests, the length of season, the number of coaches, and the only positive piece of legislation that has been passed today is a rather dubious cost cutting one, one that will further inflict some regulations on the sport of football which is our chief revenue sport.

Passing Proposal No. 66 will allow those institutions that want to play the 12th football game to do so. I would also add, it would also make it very easy for a number of new conferences that are springing up to develop a schedule. It would also allow those conferences now who want to expand and take in new members an opportunity to do so and meet regulations and championships.

I think this is a good proposal, and I think it is one this Convention should pass. It is an obvious source of great revenue for those that want it.

[Proposal No. 66 (page A-35) was defeated by all three divisions.]

[Proposal No. 67 (page A-35) was withdrawn.]

President Fuzak: I would like to comment that the chairman and the parliamentarian agree that No. 68 is out of order.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I appeal the decision of the chair.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Fuzak: There is a desire to appeal the ruling of the chair. Perhaps I should explain why it has been ruled out of order. It is not in order because, very briefly, it requires a Constitutional enabling act, a Constitutional provision; and it does not contemplate the kind of thrust of the particular motion. There is no Constitutional authority to support this one. This was called to President Horn's attention at the Special Convention and he was offered the assistance of the staff in drafting this. He was also written prior to this Convention and offered the same assistance to make this proper by drafting a Constitutional provision.

It has been the ruling of the chair this is out of order, and President Horn appeals the ruling of the chair.

Mr. Horn: As I have discussed this with the parliamentarian, I should like to briefly lay down the case on both of these which have been ruled out of order. I had an exchange of correspondence with James Cleary, who is one of the people that helped prepare Robert's Rules of Order. I realize that this Convention at this point does not have any particular procedures that bind it.

Mr. Chapman has several volumes in front of his desk plus his own very fine mind. What my case would be on arguing why I appeal the decision of the chair, and I cannot get in the merits of the proposal, but only in argument with your argument, would be

that I do not need a Constitutional amendment because Bylaw Article 2 already concerns extra events and in 2-2-(h) it says the competing institutions shall receive a share, and it doesn't say all the shares after the sponsor.

The only real limitation in 2-2-(h) is that not more than 25 per cent of the gross receipts can go to the sponsoring organization. In 2-2-(i) the NCAA regulates the TV-radio sponsor and broadcasts. Now, in 2-2-(j) it requires an audited financial report. Then in 2-2-(l), the Council determines the number of bowl games and, therefore, executive regulations 4-1, which is what I am speaking to amend, ties two Bylaws 2-2-(h) and (r), which all this activity concerning the bowl games takes place. It is that executive regulation that Proposal No. 68 seeks to amend.

As I mentioned earlier, the Bylaw does not say the competing institution shall receive not less than 75 per cent. The executive regulation No. 4-1-(b) defines gross receipts to include TV, and the only exception in that is the 25 per cent limit on the sponsor who had a commitment prior to August 14, 1949, a legal commitment as to the stadium, improvements of the stadium.

Apparently, I would argue that no Constitutional amendment was needed for that exception. I must say I find it ironic that the NCAA Council has offered Proposal No. 272 in our regular Convention which would . . .

President Fuzak: We are addressing ourselves only to No. 68.

Mr. Horn: I think this is on the principle of whether you need a Constitutional amendment.

President Fuzak: The other one has not been ruled out of order, sir.

Mr. Horn: No, but I am mentioning it where you have offered it, where you will recap further from gross receipts from a member institution in a bowl game—50 per cent of those receipts for the graduate scholarship program. Now, no Constitutional amendment has been offered to sanction that, I merely suggest, in our regular session.

Mr. Cleary, who is one of the editors and authors and sponsors of Robert's Rules of Order, when asked if Constitutional authorization is required for enactment of Proposal No. 68, he says, "No, unless it can be demonstrated that all past legislative actions on whose substance the Constitution is silent have involved constitutional amendments. Though I am unfamiliar with the history of NCAA legislative action, my intuitive judgment is that some, if not many or most legislative actions on whose substance the Constitution is silent have been enacted by normal procedures, i.e., presentation of a resolution and passage by a majority vote. Further, if it is true that NCAA 'has acted to utilize some of the funds from extra events, i.e., bowl games,' your argument that the issue is not one of principle but rather one of actual dollar-distribution is a valid one."

Then in response to the question, "Does Bylaw 2-2-(h) preclude implementation of Proposal No. 68, if adopted as an amendment to the Executive Regulations?" Or, to put it another way, does Proposal No. 68 require an amendment to the Bylaws?

His opinion states, "The answer to either question is, no. The reasons which you cite in the third paragraph, page 3 of your letter

are valid ones. Further, it might be argued that the actual wording of Bylaw 2-2-(h) would suggest that the intent was twofold: (1) to assure that the competing teams would receive at least some portion of the gross receipts; and (2) to assure that 'in no event shall more than 75 per cent of the gross receipts be paid to or retained by any sponsoring person or organization.' If the intent were to stipulate that, after the sponsoring person or organization received 25 or less per cent, the competing institutions are to divide the remaining receipts, Bylaw 2-2-(h) would say simply that. It appears that the issues of precisely how much would go to the competing institutions and whether any revenue of the 75 or more per cent remaining could be used for other purposes were intentionally unaddressed for the purpose of relieving the Constitution and Bylaws of the responsibility of administering policy (a parliamentarily sound concept)."

Then I asked him, "Is it parliamentarily correct to introduce Proposal No. 68 as an amendment to the Executive Regulations?" He said, "Yes. Proposal No. 68 does not conflict with any stated provisions of either the Constitution or Bylaws."

Then I asked him, "Does the absence of a provision stipulating a governing manual jeopardize the proper disposition of Proposal No. 68?"

He stated, "Yes, and the proper disposition of any other proposal and, in general, the proper conduct of all business. One possible remedy would be the moving and carrying of an incidental motion temporarily establishing a governing manual."

Then he goes on to say possible remedies would be if the Convention would agree on Robert's Rules of Order, which they apparently are planning to consider in the regular convention. In brief, Mr. Chairman, that is the long, dull legalistic boring case, which I respectively appeal the ruling of the chair.

President Fuzak: The extra event authority given in Constitution 3-6 and Bylaw 2-2-(h) relate only to the supervision of the physical and athletic soundness of postseason contests as does the rest of 2-2 for the participating institution and the protection of their athletes. The history of the relevant legislation in the extra event area never has contemplated the Association intervening and dividing the disbursement of one member's receipts to others.

The basketball tournament is not an extra event under 3-7-(c), it is an NCAA-sponsored event. The income is for the NCAA to distribute. The postseason football contests are productions of other organizations whose conduct of the event we regulate. The history of the Association is always to put significant departures from previous practice to the membership in the form of a constitutional amendment to ascertain whether there is sufficient sentiment, two-thirds, to go into this new direction. This is the tradition and history of the NCAA. This was done in the Special Convention by an enabling act, Constitution 10, to enable the enactment of Bylaws on personnel and squad limits.

This is something the NCAA has not done before. That is the reason for the ruling.

Mr. Horn: I can appreciate that. Of course, the only question I would answer, maybe you will prefer to answer it in the regular Convention, is what is the sanction for Proposal No. 272?

[The chair was sustained in its ruling.]

Resolution: Television Plan

Mr. Horn: I move the adoption of No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Fuzak: The ruling of the parliamentarian, agreed to by the chair, is that the tradition of the TV Plan always has been submitted to the membership for adoption by a two-thirds referendum. The proposed resolution drafts in part a TV Plan, but does not simply authorize it being drafted and, hence, should receive the same two-thirds affirmative vote.

The history of the TV Plan always has been controllable appearances not division of the income. This is at least not without the two-thirds approval by the total membership. To formalize this tradition, the Council is proposing No. 281 for the 70th Convention, which provides for a constitutional two-thirds act enabling a TV Plan.

Mr. Horn: Mr. President, I appeal the ruling of the chair. I would argue that this is a much stronger case than the previous one. Obviously, this is a resolution; and I am seeking from the Convention to direct the TV Committee in their future contracts to provide for the distribution as stated in the proposal.

As I understand it, as you suggest, the practice has been once the TV Committee prepares that Plan it does go to the membership for a vote of two-thirds of those who do decide to vote. Now, the questioning gets down, in my judgment, that the Convention, by a majority vote, directs one of its committees in a specific area. In our regular Convention, the NCAA Council has proposed No. 281, which would legalize the two-thirds vote as you have indicated.

I mention, of course, that the practice has been going on for years, the two-thirds vote, but apparently, in your judgment, a lack of sanction. Again, I would entertain the questions I asked Mr. Cleary, one of the compilers of Robert's Rules of Order. "Can the convened delegates instruct the NCAA Television Committee?" His opinion, "Most certainly, yes. Any committee, whether standing or special, is subject to direction and control by the assembly, i.e., the Convention of delegates, the body which created it. Proposal No. 69 purports to do exactly this."

The next question I asked, "Does the 'tradition' of using a mail referendum approval of a TV Plan, requiring at least a two-thirds majority, require that any instruction to the Committee by the convened delegates also requires a two-thirds majority?"

His opinion, "No. Tradition must yield to the will of the majority of those delegates present and convened for deliberation and decision, given the existence of a quorum. If the presiding officer rules to the contrary, the decision is appealable."

That is the case I would make, in brief, Mr. President. I think it is important under the vote we cast now on those appeals can be pointed to by others in other discussions in years to come, as to the practice of this Convention. I think you should ask yourselves, do you want to refrain from instructing a Committee by majority vote, especially when this Committee's Plan is subject to a two-thirds membership vote.

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): I speak to you on behalf of

the NCAA TV Committee in strong opposition to Proposal No. 69. It is, in our opinion, unrealistic.

President Fuzak: The question before us is the appeal. The debate should be directed toward the appeal, the advisability of the appeal. You will have an opportunity to speak subsequently if the chair is overruled.

Celeste Ulrich (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): I would like to ask, first of all, about a procedural question. What is the manual under which we are operating at this Convention?

President Fuzak: We utilize Robert's and other authorities. They are essentially based upon Robert's, but they are used as an aid or guide which certainly is appropriate for any organization. If they were used specifically to the question of adoption of our Bylaws and Constitution, this would be in question.

Ms. Ulrich: I understand how such a custom has come about during the last 70 years, but I do believe we are almost at a point of parliamentary chaos in this Association. I would take exception to the fact that, and it would appear to me we are being denied the opportunity for what I think would be honest debate about an idea by being advised that this idea will never come to the floor because it has been ruled out of order by a nebulous manual of tradition. I think that probably also defies a certain democratic intent of this Association that I bemoan.

[The chair was overruled.]

President Fuzak: No. 69 is properly before the body, and the debate is on the resolution itself.

Mr. Horn: Let me state that I appreciate the cooperation I have had from various officials in the NCAA in terms of providing information when I have asked for it. This particular proposal, which would direct the NCAA Television Committee to specify, in the formulation of the next NCAA Television Plan and subsequent such Plans, that after providing incentives for participating institutions which shall not exceed 15 per cent of the total plan, the remaining net proceeds shall be prorated equally to member institutions as follows: That is, 50 per cent to members who are in Division I in football; 25 per cent to members who are in Division II in football; and 25 per cent to members who are in Division III in football.

I sent to the presidents of the NCAA member institutions on July 11 a table that broke down the number of football playing institutions. We had roughly at that time—I am sure it is more now—449 institutions that played football out of then 696. I know we are over 700. In the 1974 Plan, as I read the Committee's report, there were 54 television exposures. Then of the 449 that played football at that time, 113 institutions received some proceeds as a result of the Television Plan.

According to the '74 TV Committee Report, the NCAA participating members received \$16,000,000 in television rights in '74 and a like total, presumably, in the fall of 1975. Applying the percentages I have noted, what we are talking about is 15 per cent of the \$16,000,000, which would be approximately \$2.4 million that would go to the participating schools. This would be about \$46,000 per team.

Now, 5.5 per cent of the \$16,000,000, or about \$880,000 would go to the NCAA as a result of an assessment. The '74 report indicates

that various fees were subject to a 5.5 personal assessment by the NCAA to cover television administrative expense, promote college sports and fund the post graduate scholarship program. The remaining proceeds, then, would be pro-rated with 50 per cent, as I indicated, that is \$6.3 million plus to the 129 members in Division I at that time.

That is about \$49,000 a member. Then 25 per cent, \$3.1 million to the 121 members who were in Division II. That, obviously, varies with the number you have in each division. At that time it was about \$26,000 per member. Now, 25 per cent, \$3.1 million, to the 199 members then in Division III in football. That is about \$16,000 per member. It should be noted under the proposal, that those participating would receive not only their participation share, and that is \$46,000, but also their pro-rata share under the Division I, II or III, whatever.

A team playing once on a television spot would get \$46,000 for participating, plus another \$49,000, if it was Division I, at the end of the season. This is roughly \$100,000. This memo went out also including the bowl games, which is not relevant at this point, for a total of the package, if both operated, for \$64,000 for Division I, \$34,000 for Division II and \$21,000 for Division III.

Mr. President, as I said from the very beginning, I am not wed to any particular percentage formula. What I want to do is to get this idea aired, that we are a collective voluntary association of over 700 members, and we have got to think in terms of balance and diversity for all athletics. The reason I got into this I am increasingly concerned when schools drop swimming, or water polo, drop golf, tennis, one sport after the other, to save the football team.

Now, I happen to believe in the football team. We are making money. This proposal, if adopted, is not going to help Long Beach. We are not going broke. Now, on the other hand, there are Division II and Division III institutions, and some Division I institutions, that are going rapidly broke. I think the adoption of this proposal would give greater freedom of choice to the American television viewer.

As far as I am concerned, Notre Dame, Ohio State can be on every weekend. If that were so, I think we might get a \$30,000,000 contract for the season and it would help everybody. I would like them to know when they are on, they are on at the expense of members in Divisions II and III, and particular, who have slowly dropped football because they just can't compete with the heat on Friday night, Saturday, et cetera, as the television tube carries these games in our living rooms. I want them to have their glories, I want them to not only help their conferences but to help all members of this Association.

I think this, as I wrote many of the presidents, some of whom are here, this Convention is the crossroads of the NCAA. We have very vital decisions we are going to make in the next regular session. One of them is to face up to a balanced and diversity in intercollegiate athletics and not simply that football is everything.

Mr. Peters: As I indicated a couple of minutes ago, I speak to the Convention on behalf of the NCAA Television Committee and in very strong opposition to Proposal No. 69. In our opinion, the pro-

posal is unrealistic, unfair, and not only detrimental to the TV Plan but to the National Association.

In August, 1975, in a memorandum to the membership, we outlined the fact if the proposal were to be adopted it would mark the end of a control of college football television. The result would be unlimited telecasting by a handful of college teams and, in our opinion, an end to many of the benefits that go to the Association and its members from the present TV Plan.

Specifically, on Proposal No. 69, the major institutions which make it possible to sell the Plan would refuse to participate in the series for the 15 per cent incentive figure mentioned by President Horn, and the football TV series would become, as I suggested earlier, an unsaleable commodity in the TV market place.

In addition, the present television income distribution plan of many conferences would be destroyed by this national distribution plan. Determination would force the proposal requirements of the NCAA enforcement program, would also bring to an end the effectiveness of the Association as a legislative and administrative organization.

We of the NCAA sought legal opinion from counsel. Very briefly, in their opinion, the revenue sharing proposal would magnify the likelihood of legal attack against the Plan in the future and, therefore, from a legal standpoint our counsel recommends against the proposed amendment. To amplify just a bit on one of the points I mentioned, it may be the most important point of all, I am reminded that one of the essential goals of the Television Plan is protection on the number of games which will be televised. Should those rules be withdrawn, it is easy to imagine that a Saturday night television or Saturday television, from 12 noon to 10 p.m., perhaps the games to telecast would be a local major conference, a national key game, et cetera.

A day-long competition would dramatically be more damaging to each college in the nation than a competition phased down by one NCAA television game each Saturday or an occasional game. Any funds realized from the National divisional rights, these would match the damage done by loss of such protection.

In the final deliberations of the NCAA TV Committee, we rejected No. 69 unanimously as politically and economically unsound. We urge, in the strongest possible way, a negative vote on this proposal.

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I would like to say collectively for some 300 institutions, close to 300, who would not benefit by any change in the existing TV Plan. In fact, we would be hurt in the long run, I am sure, by the reserve funds that are put into sponsoring sports, other than football, in which we do compete for national championships. I hope we are not shortsighted in overlooking this very important factor.

Paul Dietzel (Ohio Valley Conference): I am really perplexed any time we talk about economy measures, about whose economy. You know, it is coming from some place, from one pocket to the other, and it is just hard for me to quite understand it. Since we have a parliamentary question on how this has been handled, I think maybe it might be wise to handle this economy measure like

we have all the others and table it. I move we table this proposal.

[Motion was seconded and defeated.]

Dick Perry (University of Southern California): Since President Horn deemed it necessary to take football into the living room, I suspect I ought to speak to the issue. I think I would like to suggest a philosophical premise that has not been discussed yet. That is our affiliation with institutions of higher learning. My understanding is that our fundamental purpose is to search for truth.

In addition, we are charged historically with the responsibility to permeate the culture in which we exist. My understanding of the free enterprise system suggests that individual persons and/or institutions ought to determine the important things in their lives. Our university has placed high value on our intercollegiate program in football in particular. We have committed our human and physical resources to that effort. Our president has informed me, as director of athletics, it is my responsibility to return to him a bottom line figure that balances.

I ask no help from Mr. Horn or from NCAA. I see that as an institutional responsibility consistent with the free enterprise system. I see that any infringement on that kind of individual opportunity would do nothing but detract from the best interest of intercollegiate athletics as we know it today.

Stanley Marshall (NCAA Secretary-Treasurer, South Dakota State University): For those of us in Division II and in Division III, the wording of this piece of legislation sounds very nice at the outset. Those percentages look good. In reality, however, they are not workable. I can see no reason why South Dakota State University should claim a major share of a television game at Ann Arbor, Michigan between the University of Michigan and Ohio State. That is part of their gate and their operation.

I personally believe that in the best interest of this Association the Division I institutions, particularly those who play the strongest football, the strongest basketball, have gone a long way in the support of an Association that can sustain over 700 diversified members. Approximately, 65 per cent of the funding for this Association, from which my institution benefits greatly, comes from Division I basketball. The Television Plan, to the best of my knowledge, has never been mishandled.

Furthermore, many of the Division I institutions make a great sacrifice to be a part of that Plan. I can think of probably 10 institutions represented in this room who can sell their own program coast-to-coast and be in Brookings, South Dakota every Saturday at 2 p.m. They give up considerably to participate in the Plan, in the best interest of all of us.

I certainly hope that those of us in Division II and Division III will do the right thing and overwhelmingly vote down this proposal.

Mr. Horn: I am overwhelmed by the charity I detect in Division I is having for the Association. I think that is great. I am delighted that some of the Association's expenses are paid by that television contract, but I think at this point, the principle is that most Division I institutions who are on that TV contract, the 54 that appear and the 113 that profited in some way through conference arrangements with the exception of independents such as Penn

State, Notre Dame, most of them already share with others in their conference, weak or strong. They have a spirit that you can't just have one institution in that conference who is making all the money that the gentleman suggested was sort of their cultural heritage and right.

I don't deny that I want to see the participants get a good share. As I say, maybe we have to change the percentages in future Conventions. That is fine. We will work on that. What I think is important is a principle that we are in there representing the student-athlete, national, amateur, collegiate athletics, and we should be working for the good of all in this Association, not just a few.

Later on in the regular Convention, I will have a proposal that I hope is addressed to that one. At this point, I urge you to think through very clearly the principles we are operating under and the price we can argue over later.

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference): I agree with all that has been said by those in opposition to No. 69. It seems to me ultimately that it is imminently unfair for those institutions and those conferences which have made the kind of commitment and the huge investment that it takes to conduct their programs at the level which makes possible a generation of the current television incomes to suddenly and arbitrarily deny them that income by this proposal. I believe what the membership will be doing, if it passes this resolution, is either to risk creating a force outside the present NCAA structure in which NCAA members will receive no protection and no income, or to ultimately destroy the income which it desires to share.

C. D. Henry (Big Ten Conference): Most of my athletic life, as most of you know, was spent at Grambling College, which is a Division II school. I am glad they were included in the TV Plan because it gave Grambling College a chance to make some money. Now, the school was concerned about it because they had an exception in the Plan. It appeared to me that if you could go to the five marked exceptions, whatever the exception is, and try to tell yourself reasonably or naturally, as we do on a play-back plan, then you had a chance.

It would appear to me if you cancel yourselves on the regional basis or if you cancel yourselves on the national basis, then perhaps you don't have any TV money coming. I wouldn't expect anyone to give me anything for TV if I didn't earn it any more than I don't expect to get some welfare food stamps when I get back home.

[Proposal No. 69 (page A-36) was defeated.]

Mr. Horn: I appreciate the courtesy of the delegates. We shall refine this proposal and perhaps present it later. To complete the record, I would like to enter in the record the exchange of letters between President Cleary, who was one of the editors of Robert's Rules of Order and myself. With this addition, that in checking with Mr. Hansen, I am informed that none of the extra event money goes into the NCAA. I wanted to clarify that in the correspondence, if I might introduce it.

[Note: President Horn's correspondence with Mr. Cleary and Walter Byers, NCAA executive director, were entered into the record. The

verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

[Proposal No. 70 (page A-37) was withdrawn.]

Amendments

James Hawkins (Fort Valley State College): On behalf of the Council I wish to move Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 71 makes it possible to make Bylaws 6-4, 6-5, and 6-6 common Bylaws.

President Fuzak: I am sure that most of you understand common Bylaws are ones that must be approved by a majority in each division. In the reorganization, this was structured so that common Bylaws must be approved by a majority vote in each of the three divisions. If one division votes it down, it fails. This one makes those Bylaws part of the common Bylaws.

[Proposal No. 71 (page A-37) was approved by all three divisions.]

Terminal Championships in Division III

President Fuzak: Part A of No. 72 has now become a common Bylaw by the adoption of Proposal No. 71.

Raymond Whispell (Muhlenberg College): I would like to move, on behalf of the Council, adoption of No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

Division III Steering Committee, because of overwhelmingly straw votes at various times throughout the past two years, have decided to recommend this to the Convention. We feel very strongly that the importance of Division III championships will be enhanced greatly by this proposal.

[Proposal No. 72 (page A-37) was defeated by Division III; approved by Divisions I and II (due to inclusion of common Bylaw, must be approved by all three divisions to become effective.)]

Terminal Championships in Division II

Hubert Heitman (University of California, Davis): I move adoption of Proposal No. 73, Part A.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is another proposal that has come out of the economy meeting that was held last year. At the economy meeting there was an overwhelming expression on the part of Division I for terminal championships. There also is a fairly heavy support from Division III. The members in Division II, however, at the economy meeting voted against this. I think it is obvious that the members of Division I would like to have their championships for themselves.

I would like to urge your support of this. There is one thing, I think if we are ever going to have a sense of unity in Division II, we need to do is to have some pride in Division II and realize our championships would stand for something.

C. A. Bautz (Bloomsburg State College): Being a Division II school, we would be opposed to this type of action from the standpoint we feel our student-athletes would be prohibited from being seen nationally. A good example is Shorty Hitchcock, a wrestler, who was the outstanding wrestler in the Division II and the Division I championships.

He was from our institution. We would be opposed to this type

of activity which would prohibit our student-athletes from getting this recognition.

Rummy MacIas (National Wrestling Coaches Association): Speak-for the National Wrestling Coaches Association, if this legislation was passed, it would hurt the wrestling program in America. You can check the records back about five years and five of the final lists in the national championships were from Division II. If this legislation passed, there is a notation on the next page that specifies this would become effective immediately. It would give our schools, particularly our conference, the North Central Conference, the NCAA Division II life.

It would not give us the opportunity to change over to Division I immediately. Consequently, we would be turned away from the championships at Tucson this coming March. Passing this legislation would defeat or more or less bury wrestling. Why penalize a wrestler or athlete in Division II just because he didn't get the grant-in-aid to go to a Division I school? I am a member of Division II myself. Still my fellow colleagues felt I was worthy enough to be elected president of the National Wrestling Coaches Association. I say we cannot pass this. This will be total mortality.

C. D. Henry (Big Ten Conference): I guess I have trouble with this. In an Olympic year I would like to know if you have made provisions for Division III and Division II athletes to move on? I have seen the best hurdlers in the world come from Division II schools, the last Olympic gold winner and the one before that. Now, do we pick them up or do they languish on because they want a terminal championship in a division without automatic entry into the Olympic trials? I am asking a question.

William Exum (Kentucky State University): It is a different situation. There are times that you have to make in order to qualify regardless of whether you are from Grambling or South Texas or Southern University. You have to come up to those standards. The expenses will be the trial athlete, room and board if he comes up. Are those provisions? This is a little different situation. Of course, Kentucky State is a Division II institution. I am opposed to this type of legislation. I have been very consistent in all the years. I just figured out how fatal things can be. When it says "total mortality", that is fatal itself. [Laughter]

Corey Van Fleet (Oakland University): I want to speak on behalf of the athletes in the individual sports who have to make time cut-offs to go to Olympic trials. You can't do it without competition. In Divisions II and III championships, we have good competition but there are always three or four world class athletes who will prosper by a privilege of going to Division I and raising the best in the world; and that is the only way we are going to make the sport and get ahead. This goes for every individual sport that we have.

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): I speak in opposition to the position also. One of the previous speakers mentioned we have to develop pride for Division II championships. I don't believe that. We have hosted national championships in Division II on our campus. We had national champions as individual winners. The pride is there. What we are talking about here is the privilege of this outstanding athlete going one step further.

I speak also with the background, when we went into the proposition that in reclassification we weren't going to deny these athletes participation in qualifying meets. Inasmuch as we in the Olympic movement are aware, there were quite a few of the qualifying meets that were established as the NCAA championships. If this motion intends to deny the outstanding athlete from participating, we would have had quite a few athletes that would have been eliminated from our Olympic team.

Robert Guelker (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville): While I fully understand the arguments for the proposition, I have to oppose it; and I would like to approach it from the angle that this possibility of moving up into Division I championship has been a great incentive to our program. We are proud of the wrestling program we have. It has developed in the last number of years. We like to feel that our coach can attract wrestlers but, unfortunately, the rules that we have permits only one sport to move up to Division I.

I think our wrestling team can compete in Division I, but can't because of the regulations. This would prohibit good athletes from moving up. We feel it has been good for the program and it has been helpful, and it is worthwhile to us.

Ray DeFrancisco (Southern Connecticut State College): In the past two Olympics we have sent two gymnasts. I feel the passage of this legislation would hinder our gymnasts from being recognized. Gymnastics is a very subjective sport where you don't have a time or anything to qualify. So the exposure is very important for a gymnast to go on to further his gymnastic ability in the Olympics. I strongly urge you to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 73 (page A-38) was defeated in Divisions I and II.]

Improper Expenses

Ralph Fadum (North Carolina State University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to specify that a member institution may not provide organized, special housing for its teams before home games or games at nearby sites. Now, in considering this proposal, I would direct your attention to the footnote under the proposal which you will find in consideration of this matter, that at the economy meeting Division III delegates to the meeting recommended the proposal; Division II delegates indicated support but did not specify any games other than the home games, and Division I recorded its opposition to the proposed amendment.

Jack Larsen (University of Southern California): I speak in opposition to No. 74. We have heard discussions on earlier proposals about the lack of consideration for differences of climate, customs and the like. We must point out there are differences in the area of location for our member institutions. For a large meet, it is critical to know where the athletes are the night before. They live in scattered locations.

The opportunity to house an intercollegiate athletic team the night before the contest is an opportunity to know that the youngsters are safe and not exposed to the dangers of freeway travel.

[Proposal No. 74 (page A-39) was defeated 241-159, two-thirds required for approval.]

Permissible Expenses

Raymond Whispell (Muhlenberg College): I move adoption of Proposal No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

As noted, Division I, at the economy convention, voiced disapproval, with Divisions II and III voicing approval. The intent of the proposal, of course, is to prohibit member institutions from providing travel uniforms for student-athletes.

[Proposal No. 75 (page A-39) was approved, 282-140.]

Athletic Awards

Hubert Heitman (University of California, Davis): I move adoption of Proposition No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is an amendment to the Constitution which would place certain further limits on institutional awards for recognition of participation in intercollegiate athletics. I think it is important that we realize that it is limited for participation awards. The changes, I think, are explained pretty well in the intent where it says that it would prohibit things like letter sweaters, jackets, blazers, blankets, watches, rings, etc., because the terminology of the amendment limits it to the item as they are specified.

I might add this is another one of the economy measures that came out of the April economy meeting. At that meeting, there was a strong feeling on the part of Division II that this would be good legislation, whereas, the other two Divisions did not agree. The Council is presenting this amendment to give the delegates a chance to vote on it.

Stanley McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): I had the pleasure of participating in the special economy conference held in Kansas City from which many of these proposals developed, and I support most of the economy measures. However, in reviewing Proposal No. 77, I felt it went too far infringing, in my opinion, on matters that ought to be the right of an institution to determine; and thus, I proposed what I felt was a less restrictive and more reasonable provision in No. 78. However, I really do not believe in any restriction in these matters.

Therefore, in the hopes that No. 77 will be defeated, I wish to withdraw No. 78.

[Proposal No. 78 (page A-40) was withdrawn.]

I may have spoken to No. 77 a little bit already. But it seems to me that we, and I speak as a broken down athlete, one of the few things besides the satisfaction of participation an athlete gets is the letter sweater. Now, that kind of went out of fashion a while back, but I find in our campus and others that I have observed, it has become in fashion, and athletes that receive those awards wear them with pride. I believe that it is a commendable thing and fine thing for student-athletes to show their participation and achievement by wearing letter sweaters and jackets.

It seems to me there are ever so many measures of much more significance from an economic standpoint or affecting economy in intercollegiate athletics than this one. This would effect some modest savings, true, but it seems to me it would be at the cost of depriving

recognition of individual student-athletes. Therefore, I hope it will be defeated.

[Proposal No. 77 (page A-40) was defeated.]

Charles Young (UCLA): I move for reconsideration of No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe the same argument that was made by Stan McCaffrey regarding the item discussed on athletic awards apply to uniforms. I believe this item would not have been approved had it not been for the fact that in recent years that has sort of gone out of style. I believe it is quite possible the situation will change, and these will again begin to become stylish. This is a matter of really institutional autonomy.

[The motion to reconsider was defeated.]

Keith Broman (Nebraska University, Lincoln): Because of the closeness of the vote requiring two-thirds, I would like a recount.

President Fuzak: That was not a two-thirds, it was a simple majority.

Mr. Broman: No, I am talking about the original one. The vote was 282-141, or something like that. That is only one or two votes from two-thirds.

President Fuzak: I think we have made progress and have left that point. Unless you get a motion of a majority to recount, I will rule that we will not recount. Do you wish to so move?

Mr. Broman: I wish to move for a recount on Proposal No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

Leo Miles (Howard University): Didn't we just have a vote and say we were not going to reconsider it?

President Fuzak: That is correct. But it is proper in the closeness of a vote, of a two-thirds type, to extend the courtesy to the individual. All I am doing is extending a courtesy, but I am asking the will of the majority to prevail on whether this is done.

Mr. Miles: Then there wasn't any need for a recount, was there?

President Fuzak: That was a motion to reconsider. I again have tried to be fair to everyone concerned. If there is true feeling that it was too close, and may have been in error, I think it is better for me to move in that direction.

[The motion for a recount was defeated.]

Permissible Expenses

Charles Neinas (Big Eight Conference): Not to delay this too much, but the effective date of No. 75 is immediately. If the Special Convention concludes today, I guess then technically the effective date is tonight. Although No. 76 was not moved as an amendment to No. 75, inasmuch as it merely delays the effective date until August, 1976, would it be out of order, sir, now to move No. 76?

President Fuzak: Since it was not moved, it is appropriate.

Mr. Neinas: Then I move the adoption of No. 76.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 76 (page A-40) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 79 (page A-41) was withdrawn.]

President Fuzak: I believe that takes care of the business before the Special Convention. We are adjourned.

[The Third Special Convention was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]

70th ANNUAL CONVENTION

OPENING SESSION

Thursday Morning, January 15, 1976

The 70th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by NCAA President John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University, in the Illinois-Missouri-Meramec Rooms of Stouffer's Riverfront Inn, St. Louis, Missouri.

4. OPENING REMARKS

President Fuzak: Please come to order. Welcome to the 70th Annual Convention of the NCAA. Once again, under a different situation somewhat, it is my privilege to welcome you and hope that we proceed expeditiously and effectively toward the conclusion of the business.

I should remind you that amendments to amendments submitted at the Convention may not increase the degree of modification of the proposal being amended. Those which increase the degree of modification are out of order. I am not going to try to review all the voting and speaking privileges—I outlined them at the beginning of the Special Convention—except to say those individual members representing affiliated members are asked to identify themselves and their affiliation when they desire to speak during the proceedings of the Convention.

Otherwise, all visitors, those with pink badges, are asked to sit in the area at the rear of the room set aside for visiting delegates, unless they are representing voting member institutions and are directly involved in their institution's legislative deliberations.

I will repeat that any sponsor intending to withdraw a proposal should report it to the headquarters suite in person or by telephone prior to the business session. This will help expedite the business of this Convention. We will then announce those proposals that are being withdrawn and, hopefully, save some time by doing so.

We briefly will review the voting procedure. We will take no voice votes. All votes will be by paddle. The chair will attempt visual determination of passage or failure. If there is doubt, the Voting Committee will be asked to take a count.

Any voting delegate may call for a count if the determination of the chair is in doubt. On divided Bylaws, those voted separately by the three divisions, we will not announce the result of the vote in any division until the voting is completed in all divisions.

We will again alternate the order in which the divisional votes are taken. This year, for the first time in some time, we are passing the introduction of Council members and Executive Committee members. I think all of you are aware of the dedicated and conscientious effort that the Council members and Executive Committee members give to your association.

As your President, I feel very grateful and greatly indebted to

them for their efforts. We are not introducing them, in the interest of time, but I think all of you should appreciate the efforts they have put into the affairs of the Association.

Bill Ashley (C. W. Post College): I would like to ask the members of the Convention to consider the possibility of voting on the issues from the conscious point of view. I have been asked by several of our local coaches association to request this, and it seems only fair to me that officials who have no connection whatsoever in an institution should be refrained from voting on these issues.

President Fuzak: Thank you. The appointment of the special committees, I will not go through the naming of all individuals on special committees. The Nominating Committee is chaired by Neils Thompson. The Committee on Committees is chaired by Eugene Corrigan; and the Voting Committee with whom you became familiar yesterday, is chaired by Aldo Sebben.

The Committee on Memorial Resolutions is chaired by Robert Frailey. We will have its report during this session.

5. REPORTS OF SPORTS AND GENERAL COMMITTEES

President Fuzak: The first item that I would like to take care of is the report of the sports and general committees. Those reports are included in your 1974-1975 Annual Reports, and we will need a motion to accept and receive them.

[The motion was regularly made, seconded and approved.]

6. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

Stanley J. Marshall (South Dakota State University): The Constitution of this Association provides that the Secretary-Treasurer shall submit to the annual Convention a report of all receipts and disbursements during the preceding fiscal year. It is my pleasure to present the report for the year ended August 31, 1975, as well as provide information on the status of the Association's membership.

The financial report, for the period September 1, 1974 through August 31, 1975, is based on the audit submitted by Francis A. Wright and Company of Kansas City, Missouri, a firm of certified public accountants. The printed report may be found in the 1974-75 Annual Reports, copies of which have been mailed to all presidents, faculty representatives and athletic directors. Additional copies are available at the registration desk.

As of August 31, 1975, total assets of the NCAA were \$1,645,865, an increase of approximately \$473,000 over one year ago. This amount is reflected in additional short-term certificates of deposit.

The Association's advisory investment trust account, which is stated at cost, declined by \$3,800 during 1974-75 compared to a drop of \$49,000 during the two previous fiscal years; however, the market value of our investments were increased by \$55,100 to \$375,131.

General income for 1974-75 totaled \$2,992,270 compared to \$2,441,005 the previous year. This represents an increase of 19.7 per cent. This increase is directly attributable to additional television rights fees for the National Collegiate Basketball Championship.

Association expenses rose 11.4 per cent during the past year from \$2,162,985 to \$2,410,457. This latter amount is \$332,000 under the amount budgeted.

Your attention is directed to the Annual Reports where you will find an analysis of Association spending according to departments.

This new accounting practice enables the Executive Committee to determine the cost of various services to the membership. This change has been accomplished during this past year.

You also will find the financial report of the National Collegiate Realty Corporation. The NCAA owns all of the stock of the Realty Corporation; and the Corporation, in turn, owns and maintains the building which houses the national office staff. This arrangement is necessary because of the laws of the state of Kansas.

You will note that the cost of the national office building, including land and tenant improvements, is \$1,776,678. The quality of construction, as well as the appreciation of the land, make our building worth substantially more than this amount today.

As of August 31, 1975, the building mortgage amounted to \$619,604. That balance has now been reduced to \$289,500 and the Executive Committee has committed an additional \$100,000 toward retiring this debt when the money becomes available this spring. This means that the mortgage on the national office building should be completely retired no later than January 1, 1977.

Combined assets of the NCAA and the Realty Corporation are \$3,316,116. These are true assets.

I am pleased to report that during 1976-77, the Association will embark on a new program of additional service to the membership. From the NCAA's share of the television rights fees, the Association will pay a portion of the travel expenses of those teams which participate in NCAA championship competition.

A Team Championships Travel Reserve Fund has been established by the Executive Committee in the amount of \$100,000 taken from excess receipts from 1974-75 operations. It is anticipated that the Association's financial position will enable us to allocate surplus funds each August to advance this very good program.

Only those events which do not generate sufficient income to pay expenses of the competing teams will participate, and present projects indicate the fund will have sufficient revenue to guarantee approximately 60 per cent of team expenses during 1976-77.

The Executive Committee is continuing to seek ways and means of generating enough revenue to guarantee travel expenses of all teams and individual medal winners in NCAA championships.

For the 26th consecutive year, the NCAA membership increased, this time by 2.2 per cent. The record is now 824 members of which 704 are active colleges and universities; 57 are allied conferences; 24 are associate institutions, and 39 are affiliated organizations.

New members in the past year include:

ACTIVE MEMBERS

Division II

University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown
Florida International University
Pfeiffer College
Pembroke State University
Guilford College
Grand Valley State Colleges
Central Oklahoma State University
University of Arkansas, Little Rock
University of Alaska, Anchorage

Division III

Connecticut College
Barrington College
Mercy College
Sarah Lawrence College
Rutgers University, Newark
Eastern Mennonite College
Tri-State College
Ferris State College
Millikin University
Concordia Teachers College (Neb.)
Buena Vista College
Upper Iowa University
Rocky Mountain College
California State College, Stanislaus
California Lutheran College

AFFILIATED

College Divisions Commissioners Association
National University & Collegiate Karate League
Tri-State Intercollegiate Association

ALLIED

Eastern Wrestling League
Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference
Eastern Independent Collegiate Basketball League
Sunshine State Conference
Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
Virginia College Athletic Association
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference

Mr. President, that concludes my report and I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

7. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Stan Bates (Western Athletic Conference): Your Executive Committee consists of eight members appointed annually by the NCAA Council plus President Fuzak and Secretary-Treasurer Marshall. It meets three times each year to supervise the Association's financial affairs and the conduct of its meets and tournaments.

I am pleased to report that 1974-75 was another record-setting year for NCAA championship competition. More than 11,000 student-athletes competed in the 37 national championships staged by the Association. Gross receipts from all championships exceeded \$6.2 million. Of that amount, 19.4 per cent was spent for game and administrative expenses; 1.1 per cent went to sponsoring agencies; 32.2 per cent to the Association's general operating budget, and the remaining 47.3 per cent was returned to the competing institutions in the form of travel expenses and distribution of net receipts.

Paid attendance for NCAA championships during 1974-75 was 641,799. This also was a record. Division I basketball, the perennial leader in this category, drew 170,686 paying customers. Division I baseball was the only other event to exceed 100,000 with 121,271. Basketball's gross receipts amounted to \$3,970,000. Financial summaries of all NCAA championships are in the Annual Reports.

As Secretary-Treasurer Stan Marshall reported earlier, your Executive Committee has made a long-range commitment to provide funds to pay travel expenses of all athletes who compete in NCAA championships. In order to accomplish this, the Committee will urge sports committees to adopt more stringent entrance requirements in individual events; and it will actively seek additional sources of revenue to finance the program.

It is estimated that the cost of travel expenses for athletes in events which presently do not generate sufficient revenue to pay their own way will amount to more than \$1 million.

Stumbling blocks to payment of championships travel have been the mortgage on the national office building and legal expenses. While we are close to retiring the building debt, our legal expenses continue to be a substantial drain on Association reserves. During 1974-75, as noted in the Annual Reports, the NCAA expended \$351,511 for legal fees. Over the past four fiscal years, the NCAA has paid more than \$1 million in legal fees and expenses. It is hoped that when legal challenges abate, additional funds will be available for membership services.

Convention Proposals Nos. 304 through 324 are revisions of the Executive Regulations already adopted by the Executive Committee. Two corrections are in order. In No. 316 the intent has been changed to read, "To adjust the formula for distribution of net receipts because of the increase in the ice hockey tournament bracket from four to six teams."

The intent of No. 317 should be similarly edited as follows: "To adjust the formula for the distribution of net receipts because of the increase in the Division I lacrosse tournament bracket from eight to 12 teams."

At its meeting here this week, the Executive Committee voted to add a new paragraph (j) to Executive Regulation 2-1 which in effect provides that a governing sports committee, or games committee appointed by it, may disqualify student-athletes and/or representatives of an institution from further participation in the NCAA championship involved for reasons of misconduct.

The student-athletes and/or representatives of the institution, of course, shall be provided a hearing upon request to the chairman of the appropriate committee. If it is determined that misconduct occurred, either by a student-athlete or representative of an institution, the institution further may be declared ineligible to compete in the Association's next championship of the sport involved.

Inherent in this proposal is the institutional prerogative to appeal to the Executive Committee in the event it is declared ineligible for a subsequent championship in that sport. Each games committee will hold a pre-tournament meeting with the competing coaches to review and explain this policy.

The Executive Committee adopted several changes in Executive Regulations as well as accounting practices which should result in approximately an additional \$117,000 being returned to member institutions or their personnel from championship competition.

Among these changes are: Elimination of the NCAA's eight per cent share of net receipts in individual-team championships; increasing the host institution's share of the net receipts from five

to 10 per cent, or \$200, whichever is greater; increasing per diem for committee members from \$35 to \$40; adding expenses of one meeting (previously charged to the event) of five sports committees to the general operating budget; increasing the value of postgraduate scholarships from \$1,000 to \$1,500 each, and paying expenses of delegates to the sports committees of other organizations.

The 1975 Annual Convention referred to the Executive Committee a proposal to provide the Drug Education Committee with funds equal to those paid by wine and beer advertisers on NCAA telecasts. The Executive Committee felt it could not support this recommendation; however, it did allocate \$5,000 to the Drug Education Committee specifically for a program to combat the excessive use of alcohol, especially on college campuses.

As a result of the recommendations of the Special Meeting on Economy, the Executive Committee asked sports committees to adopt more stringent qualifying standards for NCAA individual events, thereby effecting additional savings for member institutions.

The Executive Committee has approved the Association's embarkation into a marketing program, net proceeds from which will be used to provide additional services to the membership such as assisting in funding of championships.

We expect this program to embrace excellent quality and good taste. We also hope that in addition to revenue, strong promotion of intercollegiate athletics will result.

I should like to compliment Walter Byers, executive director of the NCAA and his staff in the office, for the excellent manner in which they have conducted the affairs of our Association.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this report.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

8. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the Council, it is my pleasure to present this report.

We are in important times, and I should stress upon you the Council needs as much guidance from you as possible. I am going to touch on six items in this report.

Special Convention

First, let me report on the developments which led to the Second Special Convention in August and the substantial number of new regulations which flowed from the membership's efforts to place some controls on the spiraling costs of intercollegiate athletics.

The 69th NCAA Convention in Washington, D. C., a year ago adopted a resolution directing the NCAA Council to undertake certain initiatives in developing legislation to deal with the disturbing cost factors in college athletics. This led to a Special Meeting on Economy held in Kansas City, Missouri, April 24-25. A total of 52 delegates attended the meeting, representing all divisions and all districts of the Association, and included presidents, faculty athletic representatives, athletic directors, conference commissioners and coaches. During the course of the Meeting on Economy, a number of college presidents urged strong measures in this area and urged that the NCAA Council proceed to call a Special Convention during 1975 on the basis that economy measures should be instituted immediately and to wait until the 70th Convention in January of

1976 for all practical purposes would delay the anticipated economic savings for a full academic year. Furthermore, the delegates at the Meeting on Economy seemed convinced that to attempt to shoehorn all of the economy measures into the proceedings of the regular Convention would probably be a disastrous undertaking. These prophecies seemed borne out when the Special Convention in August was not able to complete its agenda and this accounted, as you know, for the Special Convention which preceded immediately the beginning of the 70th Annual Convention.

The great many new rules stemming from the Second Special Convention have created a concern with many that the NCAA is over-legislating. This may or may not be true, depending upon the viewpoint of the observer. It seemed clear to the Meeting on Economy; and it seems clear to the NCAA Council that institutions engaging in inter-regional and national recruiting and scheduling practices—and this particularly pertains to Division I institutions and a goodly number of Division II institutions, if not some members of Division III—cannot effectively invoke meaningful economy measures at the institutional or conference level. Rather, national requirements are needed because of the very nature of the competitive activities involved.

It is apparent to the Council that another perspective should be brought to this issue. For a substantial number of years—extending back to 1968—a number of college administrators have urged athletic leaders to address themselves to cost factors. These expressions came, furthermore, from such educational groups as the American Association of Universities, the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities and from the American Council on Education. You may recall that the NCAA appointed a special committee to deal with some of these issues, under the chairmanship of William J. Flynn, Boston College, and that committee, in 1971, recommended many of the measures which were finally presented for a vote at the Second Special Convention this past summer in Chicago. The NCAA Council sponsored a great many of the proposals advanced by the Flynn Committee only to have those rejected by the membership on the basis that such details should not be considered by the NCAA until it had reorganized into divisions so that institutions of like persuasion and programs could more carefully and sensibly select the measures which would be most effective in treating their problems. It was at the 66th Convention that the NCAA at Hollywood, Florida, in January 1972, postponed certain economy proposals until reorganization could take place and that eventually led to the First Special Convention of the NCAA in Chicago, August 1973, to bring about divisional reorganization.

My point here is that this history inevitably led us to considering deailed economy measures once reorganization was accomplished and, against that history, it is understandable why the membership would press forward to address these problems of cost savings. That is precisely what happened when the Second Special Convention was called to order last summer. The Council thought it appropriate to remind the delegates of this evolution and, to a degree, it may be a self-serving historical resume, because the Council is somewhat sensitive to the charge that it is busy building a legislative

bureaucracy to control all of college athletics.

The Council attempts to respond to the demands of the member institutions and provide ways and means for the NCAA to assist them in dealing with problems which cannot be successfully reconciled at the institutional or conference level.

Enforcement

In a second area, it seems important that the Council report to this Convention the results of the last regular Convention's decision to finance an expanded enforcement program. You will recall that this proposition was approved by the Convention on the basis of increasing the dues and allowing for an additional tax upon television receipts to finance this undertaking. It already is abundantly clear that the expanded enforcement staff of the NCAA along with the revised enforcement procedures—which enable the Committee on Infractions to function more efficiently—in a short time are going to increase the respect of member institutions, their employees and their athletic representatives for the rules and policies of intercollegiate athletics. We expect this to be a disturbing experience because the immediate results are clear. More evidence of violations is going to be produced; there is going to be an increased number of cases processed by the Committee on Infractions and, undoubtedly, an increased number of findings of violations and penalties imposed. This process is going to result in additional discomfort and strain in the relationships between certain member institutions and the NCAA. This activity may well contribute to the complaint of some of too much bureaucracy in the form of the NCAA—by that I mean the enforcement of the rules is going to be the cause for some to complain more of too many rules and too much NCAA activity.

I, personally, was one of those urging the expanded NCAA enforcement role. The NCAA Council is pleased with the progress in this area because we are convinced that in a short span of time, the message is becoming clear to institutional executives and athletic and coaching personnel that you cannot gain the advantages some see by ignoring the rules which others follow.

At the urgings of such groups as the National Association of Basketball Coaches, some conferences and the NCAA Council, the Committee on Infractions has increased the severity of its penalties for serious violations and the Committee on Infractions is using to good purpose some of the new penalty provisions which the Convention has made available to it. The pressures generated in this area are intense, at times, and some are reacting strongly against the process. The most important point, however, is that progress distinctly is being made; and I believe the NCAA enforcement program is gaining the attention of some people in intercollegiate athletics whose attention to the desirability of observing the rules is sorely needed. I can speak to this first hand.

Athlete's Statement

In conjunction with the discussion of additional legislation and the enforcement program, the NCAA Council wishes to comment upon the athlete's statement which was authorized by the 69th NCAA Convention a year ago. We fully recognize that the first issuance of the athlete's statement was too detailed and, indeed, proved to

be an onerous document and task. Since that time, the Council has issued a revised form which provides for a much simpler administrative procedure and separates the form between the questions to be presented to incoming student-athletes and the questions to be presented annually to continuing student-athletes.

It is the conviction of many of us on the Council that the athlete's statement may well be the most singularly important tool for assuring observance of governing legislation that is available. For many years, institutions have used different techniques to determine whether the student-athletes who were to represent them in intercollegiate competition were indeed eligible. Some members and their conferences have taken this issue seriously and have had a detailed form which the student-athlete must complete before he could be adjudged eligible. On the other hand, many others have done little in this area. Furthermore, complicating this has been the fact that many critical questions have not been asked of the student-athlete and when it came to an investigation, he often absolved himself of any knowledge of the rules on the basis of ignorance.

The athlete's statement treats all of these several problems and we hope most earnestly that this Convention will decide to go forward with this program. We recognize that some members do not believe that the results are worth the effort. To that argument, let me comment that we do know of cases of members finding out for the first time, as a result of their administration of this form, that some of their student-athletes do not meet the rules of the NCAA, and, furthermore, it seems reasonable that all members of the Association should be interested in conscientiously determining that their student-athletes do meet the rules the institutions themselves have pledged to apply and enforce.

Legal

All of us, I am sure, desire to remain optimistic as we see the American society become larger and increasingly more complicated. Mirroring our society at large, intercollegiate athletics continues to attract more interest, competitors and institutions which desire to sponsor intercollegiate programs and—as a result of this—our athletic community becomes more complicated. It is my view that most of the things which make intercollegiate athletics more complicated are healthy signs of widespread support and interest.

One development which prompts pessimism, however, is the continued tendency of some member institutions, some staff members of institutions and some athletic representatives of member institutions to frustrate the application of the NCAA rules by testing their validity through state and Federal court proceedings. Not only does this activity drain a substantial amount of money from NCAA funds—money which could be used for more constructive and useful purposes—it also creates an unequal application of rules which is contrary, it seems to the NCAA Council, to the fundamental reason a member institution joins a voluntary association.

In all of the multiple court tests of NCAA rules and procedures, there has been only one significant decision against the NCAA. This had to do with the judgment that the alien age rule of By-law 4 was discriminatory and should be revised. Otherwise, the NCAA has successfully defended its rules and its role in all in-

stances, although in a number of cases this has been achieved only at the court of appeals level.

What does transpire, however, is for an institution, a staff member or a booster to secure a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction which enables the institution to utilize the services of a student-athlete who otherwise would be ineligible to compete. It is a recognized fact in our judiciary system that frequently the judge of the area is inclined to rule in favor of the athlete or the institution in his immediate jurisdiction as opposed to some national governing body far removed. And for a part or all of a season, a student-athlete who should be ineligible is permitted to compete to the disadvantage of institutions against which his college is competing.

Furthermore, during the past fall, we have seen coaches of member institutions attempt to frustrate the decisions of NCAA Conventions by attempting to suspend the rules that the voting delegates of our members have decided to impose. It is interesting that in some of these instances, the coaches' institutions did not argue the particular rule in question on the Convention floor. The NCAA Council believes it is time to attempt to slow down this type of activity and has before you a proposal in this connection which was not favorably acted upon at last January's Convention.

In essence, this proposal suggests that member institutions exhaust internal remedies within the Association before attempting to frustrate the Association's rules by legal action. There are those who argue that it is unfair to suggest that an institution should not seek legal recourse, for example, from the time the Council rejects an appeal, if indeed the appeal is rejected and the time the annual Convention could consider the institution's argument—the annual Convention being the ultimate authority in hearing internal appeals. There may be some point to that argument, but let me say also that it is extremely unfair to the vast majority of member institutions and their athletes to have an institution use an ineligible player—at least a player adjudged to be ineligible by the appropriate NCAA committees and appeal boards. Under court proceedings at the present time, it would be possible for a college with such an ineligible player to win a conference championship and compete in the NCAA tournament before the matter could be finally adjudicated in the courts. We think that this unfairness far outweighs any unfairness which might flow from the fact that the institution should exhaust its internal remedies before seeking court relief. The Council's proposal in this regard isn't a total cure of the problem—but it certainly would be a step in the right direction of reminding member institutions of certain fundamental obligations they assume when they voluntarily decide to assume membership in a voluntary association.

Reorganization

During my earlier comments in this report, I referred to the reorganization of the Association which took place in Chicago in August 1973. The motivation for that reorganization was to create divisions whereby institutions of like persuasion and programs could achieve a national legislative forum to deal with pressing recruiting and economic issues which could only be effectively resolved

at the national level. At the time the Reorganization Committee recommended that plan it recognized—as did the Council—that additional refinements would inevitably be necessary. During the past year, the Reorganization Committee has recommended additional changes in this area and the NCAA Council strongly supports the legislation carrying forward the Reorganization Committee's recommendations. Although there will be a formal round table presentation and discussion on this subject, I think I should explain to the delegates the Council's reasons for recommending the several amendments pertaining to reorganization and classification.

It is clear that the Council does not have the time to administer the rules pertaining to the respective divisions, adequately study the petitions of the institutions desiring to change divisions and to generally monitor the classification program. Thus, we are convinced that a Classification Committee representative of the respective divisions is essential.

Continued study of the athletic programs of the membership dramatizes the fact that in the sport of football, more than three divisions are needed. The sport is unique because the number of competitors and personnel in the coaching and administration of football results in a wide variance in the financial commitments which institutions wish to make to intercollegiate football. These wide ranging commitments result in programs which seem to the Council clearly to fall into four divisions rather than three.

This is dramatized by the fact that in Division II there is a sharp divergence of view as to the number of financial aid commitments which should be permitted in football. There is a group which feels that approximately 15 more financial aid commitments (that is, 60 or more) should be available. A goodly number of other Division II members believe the number should be in the low 40s. A comparable comparison can be made in Division I where the respective numbers are higher, but the difference is even greater.

Furthermore, as an example, in Division I there are a series of bowl games available for those institutions with larger programs, but there is no postseason opportunity for those in Division I with more modest programs. Whereas, the Television Plan provides for certain exposures for Division II and III institutions, those with more modest programs in Division I have a limited opportunity to gain comparable exposure.

The Council believes that not only should there be some guiding criteria to assist the Classification Committee in administering this phase of membership activity, but a probationary mechanism would greatly assist the Classification Committee and those institutions desiring to change divisions. In essence, the probationary device gives institutions a trial period to meet the criteria of the new division in which they desire to participate.

We sorely need a definite plan for handling these membership issues and we believe the recommendation program before you satisfies that need. It further perfects the reorganizational concepts approved in 1973 without disturbing the underlying strength of a single organization and the overall legislative authority of a single legislative process made possible through a common Constitution, certain common Bylaws and the two-thirds recision procedure pertaining to the other Bylaws.

Title IX

A number of committees of the Association have worked diligently to see to it that the Title IX regulations of HEW are not destructive to the financial welfare of existing intercollegiate programs—programs which in many instances are being asked to assume the additional costs of helping the development of women's programs. These efforts, in the main, have been unsuccessful. One of the disturbing aspects of this exercise has been the tendency of HEW to overreach its authority based upon the laws of Congress. We have noted the comments of an increasing number of presidents of NCAA member institutions protesting HEW directives and orders.

Possible legislative or legal challenge to HEW's legislative presumptuousness certainly are possible remedies. The Council is continuing to monitor HEW's interpretations and enforcement plans and, depending upon developments, may seek Federal legislative or judicial relief—or conclude that no further action is appropriate.

Additional

Before closing, let me report that the National Youth Sports Program experienced a seventh successful year in 1975. This year's program included 98 institutions in 72 cities and 36 states, with an enrollment of approximately 30,000 participants. The program, as you know, is a joint undertaking involving the U.S. Government, the sponsoring institutions and the NCAA. The cost of the program for 1975 was just under \$6 million.

At each of its meetings throughout the year, the Council carefully considers numerous interpretations between annual Conventions. Interpretations which are thus approved by the Council are then binding on all members after circularization, either by direct mail or in the interpretations column in the NCAA News.

Your Council remains dedicated to a program of full information and promotion of college athletics, and on that premise directs the Association's ongoing campaign to inform the public of the Association's policies, goals and activities.

Mr. President, finally, and aside from the script, I should like to depart by saying on behalf of the Council, that each of us feels that the NCAA has an outstanding staff under the leadership of Walter Byers. Our staff has become one of the most dedicated groups I have ever worked with, and I am sure that is true to the other members of the Council.

We applaud their services and thank them on your behalf publicly.

This concludes the report of the Council to this Convention. I would recommend that each one of you here be given time to read the abridged minutes of the Council meetings. Those are recorded in the 1974-75 Annual Reports.

I will then move that these reports recorded in the Annual Reports be approved by the Convention.

Richard Lyman (Stanford University): It seems to me that we should welcome the Council's reminder that effective economies in intercollegiate athletics are imperative at this time. I have heard in the last 18 hours or so a good many interpretations of yesterday's activity which would seem to suggest that many believe we are retreating from recognizing the need for these economies.

I don't believe that is true. It better not be true. There are very

few institutions, as it is, in which the real income honestly measured from sports covers the real expenditures equally honestly measured. There are even fewer institutions, indeed, I would predict there is no institution which is in a position today to carry out the conditions of Title IX under any reasonable definition without going into the red financially.

In the next two days, we have an opportunity which we cannot afford to let pass by. That opportunity is to assure the future of intercollegiate athletics by showing that we mean business about saving money.

President Fuzak: Thank you, President Lyman. The last item on the agenda for this meeting is the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I will call upon the Chairman Robert Frailey of the American University.

9. REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Robert Frailey (American University): The members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee, besides myself, are Ronald Roberts, Lawrence University and Joe Singleton, University of California at Davis.

Be it resolved; that we, the delegates to the 70th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, pay sincere and heartfelt tribute to the following members of our Association who dedicated their lives to the betterment of youth and the cause of intercollegiate athletics, and have passed away since our last national Convention.

Michael Alaux, Hunter College
Homer Barr, University of Massachusetts
Bill Bevan, University of Pittsburgh
Avery F. Blake, Swarthmore College
Howard Brown, Indiana University
Tommy Bryant, West Texas State University
Asa Smith Bushnell, NCAA TV Committee, ECAC
Owen T. (Ownie) Carroll, Seton Hall University
Hal Chalmers, Nichols College
Donald A. Clark, Marquette University
Ralph W. (Ram) Crandall, U.S. Coast Guard Academy
Carleton B. Crowell, U.S. Military Academy
Nick Denes, Western Kentucky University
James J. Dougherty, Northeast Missouri State University
Clinton William Evans, University of California
James S. Feurig, Michigan State University
Charles L. Foot, Boston College
Jerry Faulkner, West Georgia College
Frank (Sprigg) Gardner, Gettysburg University
Chuck Garrett, Kansas State University
Harvey T. D. Gillespie, Moravian College
Hubert A. Glendon, Columbia University
Robert S. Grieve, Syracuse University
Dewey (Dutch) Hay, Centenary College
Sidney Channing Hazelton, Dartmouth College
Robert L. Henry, Dartmouth College
Marshall Hughes, University of Texas

Richard J. Humeston, Yale University
Jim Lee (Earthquake) Hunt, Boston University
J. Owen Huntsman, Wabash College
Fred Jacob, Lamar University
Paul N. Johnson, Holy Cross College
Robert H. Kepker, Ohio State University
Robert W. Kilgus, Rider College
Paul E. Landis, Bowling Green State University
George H. Lanphear, University of Wisconsin
George (Doc) Lentz, Catholic University
Richard Lyons, Southwest Missouri State University
Salvatore J. Marone, Manhattan College
Frank McArdle, Stonehill College
James J. McAdoo, Swarthmore College
James H. (Babe) McCarthy, Mississippi State University
Roger D. McGill, University of Pittsburgh
Lonnie S. McMillan, Presbyterian College
Joseph R. Mellendick, Johns Hopkins University
Jack Mollenkopf, Purdue University
Dave Mishel, Boston University
Clarence L. (Biggie) Munn, Michigan State University
Edward E. (Hooks) Mylin, New York University
Nelson H. Norgren, University of Chicago
William N. Ormsby, Boston College
Louis R. Osins, Brooklyn College
Henry V. Porter, National Federation of
State High School Association
Don Powell, Kansas State University
Frederick N. Prender, Bucknell University
Gene Rozani, University of Notre Dame
Steve Seward, Virginia Tech University
Nicholas B. (Chic) Sharry, Holy Cross College
Richard A. Smith, Washington & Lee University
Carl Snavelly, Bucknell University
Clarence Stasavich, East Carolina University
McCoy Tarry, Memphis State University
James J. Walker, Central State University (Ohio)
Thomas M. Warner, Butler University
Clyde Washington, Pennsylvania State University
A. Heath Whittle, Davidson University
Walter (Pete) Wilhelm, Lebanon Valley College

This is the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. We ask that it be received and the families be notified of our expression of sympathy with assurance their contributions will not be forgotten.

[The assembly stood in a moment of silent prayer in memory of their departed colleagues.]

President Fuzak: We will assume the report is received by common consent. I should like to add if you know of someone that is not on the list that should be, please get that information to the chairman of the Memorial Resolutions Committee.

Thank you very much. We will recess at this time.

[The Convention recessed at 9:50 a.m.]

DIVISION I ROUND TABLE

Thursday, January 15, 1976

The Division I Round Tables of the National Collegiate Athletic Association were held from 10-11:45 a.m. and from 4-5:45 p.m., Thursday, January 15, in the Illinois-Missouri-Meramec Rooms of Stouffer's Riverfront Inn, J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, presiding. The panelists for both the morning and afternoon sessions included members of the NCAA Council's Division I Steering Committee, as follows: Edward S. Betz, University of the Pacific; Ernest C. Casale, Temple University; Ralph E. Fadum, North Carolina State University; J. William Orwig, Indiana University; Edwin L. Saxer, University of Toledo; Harry Troxell, Colorado State University, and John W. Winkin, University of Maine, Orono. Joining the panelists for the afternoon session was George Gangwere, general counsel for the Association.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning proposed amendments will be summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Round Table Format

Mr. Thompson explained that an attempt would be made to cover all of the amendments to be considered by the 70th Convention and emphasized that debate on the substance of a proposed amendment would not be permitted in that the primary purpose for considering each item would be to clarify or resolve any questions concerning the actual wording or intent of the proposal. He indicated that the NCAA Council's proposals would be explained, if necessary, by members of the Division I Steering Committee or other individuals who would present the proposal to the Convention in behalf of the Council. The chairman requested that those representatives of institutions or allied conferences proposing legislation be prepared to explain their proposals and answer any questions with regard to them. The delegates were requested to identify any amendments to amendments to be submitted and to announce those amendments which would be withdrawn. Mr. Thompson explained that he would call out the number of each proposed amendment and, in some cases, the general heading under which specific proposals were organized; further, if anyone had questions or comments with regard to the item announced, he should at that time approach the microphone, state his name and institution and make his comment or ask his question. It was announced that the proposals dealing with women's intercollegiate athletics and reorganization and classification would not be discussed in the Division I Round Table until the afternoon session after the delegates had an opportunity to hear the discussion on these items at the General Round Table.

Financial Aid

There were numerous questions posed with regard to Proposal No. 100, Determination of Financial Need. Among the questions posed

related to the opportunity to re-calculate need for the recipient prior to the start of each academic year, the effective date of the proposal, the source of payment for the costs incurred in administering such a need program, the counting of income from employment and aid from governmental grants for educational purposes, the opportunity to determine need on a basis other than the formula set forth in the proposal, the consideration which would be given to the so-called "emancipated student" and the effect such a proposal would have on Division I members should reorganization into Divisions I and I-A occur after the proposed financial aid on need was adopted. A straw vote was requested to determine those who would favor financial aid based on need. Mr. Thompson concluded that the straw vote would not be in keeping with the purpose of the round table—that being to clarify the proposals rather than to voice support or opposition therefor. Accordingly, he declined the request for a straw vote.

Marcus L. Plant announced that the University of Michigan would introduce a resolution to the Convention which would be an alternative proposal to No. 100 and in effect require a study to be conducted for all students entering the fall term of the 1976-77 academic year by requiring each institution to calculate the financial need of the student-athletes under No. 100 for the purpose of determining whether in fact such a proposal would be beneficial to the membership. Canisius College announced that it would withdraw No. 102 and the Missouri Valley Conference announced that it would withdraw No. 103. It was noted from the floor that No. 123 had been considered at a previous Convention, and Mr. Orwig explained the reason the Council again was proposing the amendment to the 70th Convention.

Coaching Staffs

Stanford University announced that it would withdraw No. 127, and Mr. Thompson announced that Springfield College would withdraw No. 131. There was a question posed with regard to No. 134. The sponsor of the proposal, the Pacific-8 Conference, indicated it would submit an amendment to No. 134 which would attempt to re-define "normal attrition." It was noted that the normal attrition definition did not set aside the effective date of Bylaw 12-1.

Squad Limitations

Harry Cross, University of Washington, announced that an amendment to No. 145 would be introduced to include NCAA championships in the squad limitations. It was explained from the chair that if No. 147 would pass, any subsequent amendments which were less restrictive would become moot and not eligible for consideration by the Convention.

Recruiting Benefits, Contacts, Publicity and Campus Visitation Limitations

Robert C. James, chairman, NCAA Recruiting Committee, explained that in general No. 176 was clarifying the present definition of improper benefits and that in several instances there were some parts of the proposal which would represent substantive changes in the recruiting benefits area. It was announced that No. 184 would be withdrawn.

Legal Costs

It was requested that the Council consider either interpretations or amendments to No. 215 which would clarify the meaning of an institution's "indirect" involvement in litigation as well as the institution's "failure to cooperate fully with the Association in defense of such an action in which the Association is involved." Mr. Thompson indicated that these two questions would be given consideration by the Council.

Division I Football Championship

Mr. Thompson asked Mr. Casale to explain No. 240. Mr. Casale explained the origin of No. 240 as well as the consideration which had been given to it by the Division I Steering Committee, the National Collegiate Football Championship Feasibility Committee and the Council. Further, Mr. Casale explained the proposed mechanics of implementing the Division I football championship, addressing such questions as interference with established bowl games, the academic calendars, the proposed number of games to be included in the championship structure, the proposed sponsorship of the competition, the relationship to the regular season television package, the distribution of income and receipts from the championship and the value of additional publicity to college football. In response to a specific question, Mr. Thompson indicated that the NCAA Council, in proposing the amendment, had not determined whether it would endorse it. There were considerable questions concerning the vote of the Feasibility Committee whether to propose a Division I football championship to the membership.

Mr. Thompson announced that it was anticipated that the exact format and procedures to be established for the championship through the Executive Regulations would be circulated to the membership prior to a vote on No. 240. There was concern expressed from the floor related to the effect a Division I football championship would have upon existing bowls and all-star football games, as well as the implication the proposed amendment on reorganization into Divisions I and I-A would have with regard to participants in the competition.

Hardship Rule

It was announced that the Council would submit an amendment to No. 259 to remove the words "practice and" from the proposal. There were questions from the floor related to the meaning of incapacity and to the circumstances and time period during which an injury or illness must be incurred in order to qualify a student-athlete for an additional year of eligibility based upon hardship.

Other Legislative Proposals

The Missouri Valley Conference announced it would withdraw No. 261. There was concern expressed related to the effective date kethall games which would be in effect after adoption.

Women's Intercollegiate Athletics

George Gangwere, the Association's legal counsel, answered a number of questions concerning Resolutions Nos. 325 through 327. These questions related to the legality of men's and women's intercollegiate programs being conducted under separate sets of rules and requirements. There was considerable expression from the floor

in opposition to Proposal No. 325, which would make NCAA rules applicable to all student-athletes regardless of consideration being given to their sex. The general sense of many of the comments was that the NCAA should continue to work with the AIAW in an effort to arrive at common eligibility rules; however, such a determination should be made after considerable study and effort rather than through the adoption of No. 325 which would make NCAA rules applicable to all student-athletes, September 1977. There were numerous questions concerning the meaning of the different portions of Resolution No. 325 and its implications to the application of NCAA rules to women's intercollegiate athletics. Mr. Thompson explained that the purpose of the Council in bringing Resolutions Nos. 325 through 327 to the Convention for consideration was in order for the Convention to express definitely its desires with regard to the Association's future actions in the area of common rules, national championships for women and continued cooperation with the AIAW. A considerable amount of comments and questions were made with regard to women's intercollegiate athletic programs, resulting in discussion of both the pros and cons of adopting the proposed resolutions.

Reorganization and Classification

There was considerable discussion with regard to No. 233. George Bisacca, Eastern College Athletic Conference, asked several questions in behalf of the Conference seeking clarification. He advanced the position that many of the procedures set forth in the reorganization proposals might be out of order because they would be in violation of existing Constitution and Bylaw provisions. He cited several instances to support his position. Mr. Bisacca also directed comments to Proposals Nos. 225 and 226. There was discussion and debate concerning the function of the Interim Classification Committee established by Proposal No. 223. Wiles Hallock, chairman of the Committee, answered many of the questions as did other Committee members. Concern was expressed that the listing of institutions in Divisions I and I-A was done without fair opportunity for all member institutions to make input to the Interim Committee in a like manner. Also, for various reasons, there were objections to the Division I and I-A membership listing as contained in the tentative list proposed by the Committee. Several of the conferences heretofore enjoying Division I membership in the sport of football expressed concern that they might now be listed as Division I-A. Also, there was considerable comment concerning the consideration of certain appeals by the Interim Classification Committee without the entire Division I membership being informed so that all so inclined could make appeals from the interim classification listing.

DIVISION II ROUNDTABLE

Thursday, January 15, 1976

The Division II Round Table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was held from 10-11:45 a.m. and 2-4:15 p.m. Thursday, January 15, in the Mississippi Room of Stouffer's Riverfront Inn. Franklin A. Lindeburg, University of California, Riverside, presided. Panelists included James Frank, Lincoln (Mo.) University; John Eiler, East Stroudsburg State College, and Hubert Heitman, University of California, Davis. Each is a member of the Division II Steering Committee. In addition, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University, and Walter Byers, NCAA executive director, were present.

[Note: The following is a summary of the round table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning proposed amendments will be summarized. The verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Financial Aid

Mr. Heitman reviewed Proposals Nos. 1-25. In regard to the proposal to require financial aid be awarded only on the basis of the individual recipient's need, concern was expressed over determination of need in the case of an independent student or an independent student with a family. Mr. Heitman stated that an individual may be considered an independent student if he is not being claimed on his parents' income tax return. It was stated that the student will have to sign a release permitting use of certain information and that this release would satisfy the requirements of the Buckley Amendment. The group discussed possible savings if aid were based on need, but few had specific financial figures. One member estimated savings of \$8,000; others estimated savings as high as 50 per cent of current financial aid payments. One delegate also pointed out that under the NCAA need formula, student-athletes would receive a smaller maximum payment than other students. A straw vote showed financial need would not be adopted by Division II, although opposition was not overwhelming. A straw vote on the proposal to reduce maximum awards limit in Division II football from 60 to 45 received a slight majority. Following the straw votes, the group returned to a discussion of financial aid based on need during which delegates expressed opposition to the proposal as being one of a mounting group of legislative proposals designed to restrict the institution. Other delegates spoke against the proposal on the basis that the athlete still would not be able to receive as much aid as another student; further, even though an athlete may have well-to-do parents, it is not a foregone conclusion that the parents will make money available to him for his education.

Personnel and Squad Limitations

Without discussion, Chairman Lindeburg asked for a straw vote on No. 138, rescission of squad limitations. The group voted, 58-49,

to abolish squad limitations in all sports. Subsequently, the group discussed several amendments to squad limitations and some delegates expressed a desire to retain squad limits, but change them to be the same in all divisions and for both home and visiting teams. Proposal No. 152 was suggested as the most appropriate to accomplish this latter aim. A straw vote revealed a majority favored Proposal No. 152.

Mr. Eiler proceeded to review the proposals regarding limitations on coaching staffs. He noted that Proposal No. 126, if approved, would rescind the limitations on number of coaches in all sports and in all divisions. He pointed out No. 132 was designed to permit Division II institutions to use any number of graduate assistants provided they do not recruit or scout off campus. A straw vote on No. 126 indicated Division II members to be in favor of rescinding limitations on all coaching staffs.

Recruiting

Mr. Eiler briefly reviewed the proposals on recruiting. A straw vote was taken on only one issue and it showed the delegates were opposed to No. 180, restricting head football and head basketball coaches to recruiting on campus only.

General

Several delegates expressed the desire that in the future Division II will be able to advance legislation designed to aid its programs, rather than be in a position of reacting to legislation sponsored by others. Parliamentary procedure was discussed regarding several proposals, especially those concerning home and traveling squads.

Reorganization

The assembly voted that Mr. Lindeburg should request on the floor of the business session a change in the order of business to have Proposal 234 considered first by the Convention followed by Nos. 220-242.

Mr. Lindeburg proceeded to review briefly each of the proposals regarding membership and divisions and sought a straw vote on each. The proposals specifically discussed and approved by the Division II delegates included amendments to establish a Classification Committee; to direct the Committee to immediately review divisional membership of each member institution and to place all member institutions in the appropriate divisional classifications; to establish guidelines for the Committee's use in considering a request for change of division in the sport football; to create a fourth division in the sport of football; to require institutions to continue to meet the criteria of the division to which they belong, and to establish a probationary status for institutions which petition for membership in another division but do not meet the criteria for that division at the time of application.

It was noted that No. 235 to make reorganization into four football divisions effective immediately has been ruled out of order by the parliamentarian; further, those institutions wishing to change from Division II to Division 1-A could petition for probationary status in Division I, thereby eliminating themselves from selection for the Division II championship.

Women's Athletics

William Exum, Kentucky State University, admonished the Council for not facing the issue of women's athletics squarely. Mr. Exum stated that the legality of the Association establishing championships for women is well established and he opposed delay of another year.

Walter Byers, NCAA executive director, was asked to explain the Association's legal position. He stated that the NCAA is considered "state action" under the 14th Amendment which is the equal protection clause in the U. S. Constitution. This obligates the NCAA to provide equal opportunities for men and women in intercollegiate athletic programs and that as long as the Association does not provide reasonable opportunities for female student-athletes, it has a legal problem. Merely opening up NCAA championships to women does not meet our obligation. In addition, there is no national basis for a member institution to discriminate between male and female athletes in regard to the application of eligibility rules. He cited examples where application of different eligibility rules to males and females at the same institution could result in a lawsuit involving the NCAA which would strike down the stricter NCAA rules as discriminatory, thereby placing a number of NCAA rules in jeopardy.

In response to a question as to why the Association believed its legal opinion, which is opposite of that of AIAW attorneys, to be correct, Mr. Byers offered the following rationale. First, the legal counsels of a number of member institutions have reviewed our legal opinion and no substantial disagreement has been raised by any university counsel. Secondly, the Association's two law firms have handled more sports law cases (more than 20) under the equal-protection clause of the Constitution than any other firms in the country. Specifically, AIAW attorneys have handled only one case under the 14th Amendment; therefore, NCAA attorneys are not ignorant of what federal courts are ruling in the area of equal protection.

Mr. Byers explained the thrust of two resolutions which will be considered by the Convention. Proposal No. 325 sets a deadline of September 1, 1977, as the time when NCAA legislation which applies to regular season competition shall apply to both men's and women's varsity athletic programs at member institutions. No. 326 stipulates that NCAA championships for women shall not be established until at least 1977.

As the matter was discussed further, additional questions were raised as to the advisability of delaying establishment of championships for women. Also, it was pointed out that opening men's championships to women doesn't give the women an equal opportunity to compete because they are not capable of meeting the minimum qualifications established for national championship competition. Therefore, where institutions effectively preclude a woman from a chance to compete because it is a sport in which men dominate, they are obligated to provide an activity in which she can compete, i.e., a championship for women only.

Mr. Byers stated that if a vote was taken of the people involved, both NCAA and AIAW, the vote would be overwhelming for NCAA to govern men's athletics and AIAW to govern women's athletics. Unfortunately, he stated, the U. S. Constitution and Title IX com-

pels both organizations, in his opinion, to offer championships for both men and women.

A straw vote revealed the Division II group in favor of establishing championships for women at the 1977 Convention; applying NCAA eligibility rules to both men's and women's teams, and continuing the special committee to meet with AIAW representatives.

Compliance and Enforcement

Mr. Frank reviewed Nos. 213-219. He gave special attention to No. 215 which would require a member institution to pursue internal appeal and review procedures of the Association before becoming involved in legal actions designed to exempt the member from legislation adopted by the Association. If such a member ignored this provision and was not sustained in the legal action, then it may be charged for all or part of the Association's legal expenses and subject to enforcement proceedings for violating the membership requirement.

A debate ensued in which opposite viewpoints were expressed. One delegate noted his institution's law firm feels the legislation is not properly drafted and that individuals should not be denied the right to go to court. An opposing view was presented to the effect that institutions have a great deal of control over student-athletes and others who go to court and that some members resented the Association having to pay high legal fees to solve problems of member institutions.

Miscellaneous

It was noted that the Southwestern Athletic Conference had sponsored Proposal No. 273 to permit a member institution to participate in two postseason football games in 1976 provided one of the games is sponsored as a bicentennial event.

The group discussed No. 296 which would broaden the authority of the NCAA Television Committee to cover sports other than football. It was pointed out that with the proliferation of conference basketball television programs, the Long Range Planning Committee of the Association felt that the Television Committee's responsibilities should be expanded to aid the Association in determining whether controls are necessary in that sport.

DIVISION III ROUND TABLE

Thursday, January 15, 1976

The Division III Round Tables of the National Collegiate Athletic Association were held from 10-11:45 a.m. and from 3:45-5:45 p.m., Thursday, January 15, in the Mississippi and the Meramec Rooms of Stouffer's Riverfront Inn, Ross H. Smith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, presiding. The panelists for both sessions included members of the NCAA Council's Division III Steering Committee as follows: James E. Hawkins, Fort Valley State College; Robert M. Strimer, Ohio Wesleyan University, and Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College. Stan Marshall, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer, Edgar Sherman, Muskingum College and Philip Brown, NCAA legal counsel later joined the panel.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round table discussions. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning proposed amendments will be summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Determination of Financial Need

Mr. Whispell led a discussion on the proposals regarding financial aid. It was agreed that a majority of Division III institutions used the Parents' Confidential Statement to determine financial need and that it was more appropriate for Division III institutions to continue, as planned, with the need program that will be in operation in 1979. A straw vote showed unanimous opposition to No. 100.

Home and Travel Squad Limitations

Mr. Strimer reported that Proposal No. 138 would eliminate all home and travel squad limitations and was one of the most important legislative proposals. A brief discussion was held, finalized by a straw vote with only 10 opposing No. 138.

Recruiting Benefits

A straw vote was asked on Proposal No. 176, which prohibits, during recruiting, the offering or providing of financial aid or other benefits not permitted by governing legislation. Results of straw vote was 29-34 against No. 176.

Eligibility

Mr. Strimer spoke on Proposal No. 213, which would remove the requirement of a student-athlete statement. He reported that the NCAA Council strongly opposed No. 213. It was the opinion of many that the student-athlete statement had been difficult to administer in the past because of its length. Now it was being modified in a shorter form and should remain as an important part of NCAA legislation. The current legislation would result in member institutions becoming more familiar with NCAA rules and regulations.

Obligations of Membership—Legal Costs

Proposal No. 215 requires a member to pursue internal appeal and review procedures of the NCAA before becoming involved in legal actions against the Association; if a member ignores this provision,

it may be charged for the Association's legal expenses and subject to enforcement proceedings for violating the requirement. Support of this legislation was asked by Mr. Strimer. One delegate questioned the legal right of the NCAA to prohibit an institution from going to court; another delegate expressed concern for the student-athlete who may lose some eligibility (if not able to get a temporary injunction through the court). Mr. Marshall responded that the proposal is not designed to deprive the student-athlete or the institution of due process. It is proposed to encourage a student-athlete or institution to exhaust the internal mechanics before going to court; further, that the legal costs could be used for bettering athletic programs, rather than constantly defending the rules and regulations of this voluntary Association.

Division III Criteria

Proposal No. 238, establishing an enrollment criterion for Division III members, was discussed at length. It was noted that approximately 40 Division III institutions would be excluded if No. 238 were approved. Mr. Ron Roberts, representing the Midwest Conference, sponsor of No. 238, reported that his conference had talked with other small conferences and they were in agreement that the size (male enrollment) of an institution is definitely a factor, with the larger institution having an advantage over the smaller school. Those opposing No. 238 felt that divisional membership should be based on whether institutions endorse the same policies and philosophies, rather than enrollment. It is possible for a larger institution to have a low-key athletic program. Also institutions may schedule their own opponents. A straw vote indicated an almost unanimous opposition to the proposal.

Eligibility

Mr. Strimer moved to No. 252 which permits a student-athlete to complete his four seasons of participation during a period of six years if he returns to his original institution or transfers to an institution in the same division. Supporters of No. 252 stated that more students are dropping out of school to work, some have families to support. A straw vote was requested: 63 favored, 19 opposed.

Transfer Rules

Proposal No. 254 would waive the residence requirements of the transfer rule for a student-athlete who transfers to an institution in an NCAA division which bases all financial aid on need. Generally, it was the consensus that if this legislation passed, the effective date should not be immediately; also No. 254 might promote "undercover" recruiting. Some delegates believed a more liberal transfer rule should be presented. Straw vote on Item No. 254: 47 favored; 40 opposed (vote on more liberal transfer rule: 75 favored).

Organization—Council and Executive Committee

Proposals No. 282 and No. 283 were discussed. Most agreed that the presidents of member institutions should be more involved in the NCAA. Mr. Hawkins agreed but added that the organizational rules of the Association should be followed; presidents will soon be nominated to offices in the NCAA because they are becoming more interested and involved with the Association. A straw vote was taken on No. 282, which specifies that at least three members of the Council,

one from each division, shall be college or university presidents. Results of straw vote: 21 favored; 32 opposed.

Reorganization

Mr. Smith introduced Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College, chairman of the Reorganization Committee and member of the Interim Classification Committee. Mr. Sherman reviewed the proposals on reorganization, explaining that none of the proposals directly affected Division III member institutions.

It was the general opinion that even though the proposals did not directly affect Division III, that the Division III delegates represented the "swing" vote on the proposals and should give careful consideration of reorganization. A lengthy discussion followed.

Of particular interest were Proposals No. 222, 224, and 227. No. 222 allows Division III institutions to compete in National Collegiate Championships in sports in which there are no Division II or Division III championships under Division III rules and regulations. It also was established that a Division III institution could petition to be classified as Division I in one of these sports and then operate under the Division I rules in that sport.

Mr. Sherman reported his strong opposition to No. 224 which sets up separate divisional Classification Committees on the basis that a Classification Committee should represent the whole membership, not a specific division.

Division III representatives favored Item No. 227 which prevents an institution transferring to Division III from competing in Division III championships until it meets the criteria of Division III.

Women's Intercollegiate Athletics

The balance of the Division III Round Table discussion was devoted to the resolutions regarding women's intercollegiate athletics. Philip B. Brown, NCAA legal counsel, joined the meeting.

Mrs. Sherry Bovenay, Keane State College, expressed opposition to the resolutions, stating that the AIAW does not intend to get involved with NCAA rules. Institutions now are operating under a variety of regulations, the most stringent of which applies.

One female delegate stated that if the female student-athletes were governed by NCAA rules, then the women would expect equal opportunity, not only in competition, but in services and leadership within the NCAA. It was her opinion that the divisional organization of the NCAA was not relevant to women's programs.

Concern was expressed regarding individual and institutional eligibility requirements of female student-athletes if No. 325 passed; whether NCAA rules applied to women student-athletes who were in the AIAW program; and if women student-athletes were not in compliance with the NCAA regulations, what it would do to the men's programs. Mr. Hansen responded that if a sport was classified as an intercollegiate varsity sport, under the jurisdiction of the intercollegiate athletic department, whether it was a men's, women's or coed team, the institution and individuals would be required to operate under the rules and regulations of the NCAA.

Mr. Brown confirmed that what is subject to the NCAA rules are varsity intercollegiate athletic programs. If programs are conducted by an institution in which it designates a team or individual as rep-

resenting it in varsity intercollegiate competition, then that team or individual is subject to NCAA rules. If the institution does not designate a program which it is conducting on its campus as representing it in varsity intercollegiate competition, it is not covered.

It was established that all varsity intercollegiate athletic programs must be in compliance with NCAA rules; any club or some other form of athletic program would not be required to be in compliance.

It was the consensus that women were being included too quickly under the NCAA rules and more discussion should be held before voting on the resolutions concerning women's intercollegiate athletics. There was general approval of No. 327, that a committee and study program be initiated.

GENERAL ROUND TABLE

Thursday Afternoon, January 15, 1976

The General Round Table convened at 2 p.m., Stanley J. Marshall, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer and director of athletics, South Dakota State University, presiding.

Chairman Marshall: The General Round Table will please come to order. We have a great deal to discuss in a very short period of time. We have two panels today dealing with two topics of great concern to the membership. We have roughly one and one-half hours. We have divided the time equally and will quit with the first panel when its time is up.

Discussion will be carried over into the divisional round tables, so it will not be terminated at this point.

First, all member institutions of the NCAA, in a letter dated December 5, 1975—directed to the chief executive officers, the faculty representatives, the directors of athletics—were asked to discuss on their campuses with athletic committees, personnel, students, and with all of whom this involved, including legal counsel, the matter of the position of your Association as it relates to intercollegiate athletics for women.

I will turn the meeting over to the committee charged with the responsibility of representing our Association in matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics for women and in relating to a meeting with representatives of the AIAW. This is a report and recommendations on women's intercollegiate athletics. We have with us George Gangwere, NCAA legal counsel. With him is Philip Brown, NCAA legal counsel. Next is Mr. Ed Betz, a member of the Council from the University of the Pacific. Next is J. William Orwig, Indiana University.

J. William Orwig (Indiana University): Last April I underwent some surgery in my back and following the surgery I lapsed into a coma for approximately seven or eight days. During that time I was in that comatose condition, the doctors were concerned that there might possibly be some brain damage involvement. And after accepting the chairmanship of this particular committee, I am sure their diagnosis was correct [Laughter].

You know, there seems to have been some misconception among the membership that the NCAA suddenly has, almost overnight so to speak, become aware of the women's sports program.

Let me review quickly a little historical background relative to the meetings between the representatives of the NCAA and the representatives of the women's programs.

In May, 1967, the Council appointed a committee to study the feasibility of establishing appropriate machinery to provide for the control and supervision of women's intercollegiate athletics. The chairman of that committee was Ernest B. McCoy of Pennsylvania State University.

The committee met in January 1968 and again in 1969 with the

leaders in women's collegiate athletics. Then with the enactment of Title IX of the Education Amendments Act in 1972, the resultant pressure for equality of opportunities for both sexes, it became increasingly clear that the Association no longer could delay in determining its role in the development of intercollegiate athletics by women.

Pressure from women's groups for government and intervention on behalf of the women's rights in education in intercollegiate education heightened the need for NCAA to act. A special committee on women's intercollegiate athletics, chaired by David Swank from the University of Oklahoma, was appointed in 1971.

Between July 6, 1971, and October 10, 1974, the committee met several times with the leadership of the Division for Girls and Women's Sports of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, later in the subsequent meeting with the leadership of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women.

There has been background and an attempt on the part of the NCAA to meet with the women. I felt there was some misconception because I have heard many, many times that the NCAA has never really attended itself or interested itself in women's athletics.

I thought those things are a matter of record and you should become aware of them. Now, let us briefly review the legislative background of the proposed resolutions relative to the women's sports program.

You will recall at the 69th Convention in Washington last year, there was a proposal to the Convention to have the NCAA develop a program of championships for women. The proposal was turned down by the membership, but the Convention did adopt a resolution instructing the Council to act as follows: "... that the NCAA Council prepare a comprehensive report and plan on the several issues involved in the administration of women's intercollegiate athletics at the national level in light of the existing court decisions, anticipated regulations implementing Title IX of the Educational Amendment of 1972 and present developments in women's intercollegiate athletics. That the Council's report and plan be circulated to all members of the NCAA and the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women no later than May 1, 1975. After soliciting and receiving the membership's comments, a joint committee of both the NCAA and the AIAW shall make recommendations for consideration by the Council and the Council prepare whatever proposals it believes necessary and desirable for consideration by this Convention. That the Council include in its report whether the Council believes that it would be desirable or legally necessary for the national championships to be conducted by the association or female student-athletes, either on an integrated or segregated basis, and that it direct a special committee for women's intercollegiate athletics to determine if it is advisable to conduct pilot programs for women's title championships and present the same to the membership for consideration, it being understood that no such pilot program would be conducted in the current academic year."

As a result of that resolution, the Council appointed a committee to meet with a similarly appointed committee of the AIAW, and that committee is known as the Joint Committee for Women's Sports.

That committee consisted of Edward Betz, University of Pacific, Stanley Marshall, South Dakota State; Bob Strimer, Ohio Wesleyan University; John Eiler, East Stroudsburg State College, and myself. I want to inform you that this committee met with the women's group for two days, October 23-24 in Chicago, and November 22 for a full day of discussions.

It was felt, at least by the male members of the committee, that the discussions were fruitful, from the standpoint of interchange of ideas. Then the male members of the NCAA committee reported to the Council as to the various action taken by this joint committee, and then following the mandate of the 69th Convention, which I read to you, your Council then has developed three resolutions, Nos. 325, 326 and 327, which I believe have been circulated to you.

They do not appear in your Convention Program, but they are printed. These resolutions, as Chairman Marshall has said, were circulated to you as of December 3, along with the legal opinion put together by the attorneys for the NCAA.

A copy of these resolutions and the legal opinion were sent to all members of the association and, at the same time, to the five AIAW members of the joint committee, were circulated to them as well, to inform them of the action of the Council.

At this time, I should like to call upon Ed Betz from the University of Pacific, to discuss these various resolutions with you and to lead whatever discussion you deem necessary or relative to them.

Edward Betz (University of the Pacific): Before I begin to highlight the Council report and these resolutions, I perhaps should say something about my understanding of the AIAW for perhaps many of you are as unfamiliar as I was at the beginning of these meetings.

It was organized in 1971. It is not a direct counterpart of the NCAA. There are many NCAA members in it. There are, also, NAIA members in it and National Junior College Association members in it. It is a new and developing organization, and there are a considerable number of its members who feel perhaps for the NCAA, as well as with the women's organization.

The differences in opinion, which I am going to express here now, are those which developed in the joint meetings and do not express any kind of action which the women's organization may have taken in any official meetings.

With respect to membership in championships, the women feel that there should be exclusive handling of women's athletics and women's national championships by their organization. If there would be any joining with the NCAA in the administration of women's athletics, it would have to be on a 50-50 basis with respect to voting, most committee memberships and administrative functions.

None of our actions, of course, were final; but when it was suggested a women's division might be set up, it was not acceptable.

A third stand that the women's organization takes is since no legal action has been taken with respect to the NCAA's position, we should wait for the courts to decide and take action after that point. The NCAA's position or possible position, depending upon your votes, of course, is not to deny the right to the women's organization to develop or to present national championships; but at some point in the future the NCAA may desire to hold championships for women.

The representation in this organization is by institution rather than by person, so that a woman could be the official delegate to the Convention as well as a man. I must say the likelihood at the present time, as I look over this assembly, is rather slim.

Nevertheless, this is the official position of the NCAA. With respect to the court action, our position on the advice of counsel is that to wait indefinitely before taking action would be to invite lawsuits, perhaps a multitude of lawsuits, and would, in effect, be unconstitutional action. Legal counsel will speak to this later.

As Bill has said, considerable progress has been made in the two meetings resulting in the proposals which are before you in Resolutions Nos. 325, 326 and 327. Let's consider for just a moment the first resolution, which indicates that rules be applied equally to the student-athletes who compete in those programs and the institutional employees by September 1, 1977.

This simply means that the constitutional provisions and those eligibility rules which apply to national championships should be applied to women athletes in your institutions as well as men beginning in 1977. The year of delay is, in part, out of deference to the women's organization to see what they would do at their convention this year; and in order that our organizations may, so to speak, get their houses in order.

This does not, of course, affect in-season competition with the exception of the constitutional provisions, the recruiting regulations and so forth, any more than our present regulations affect in-season competition for male athletes.

I should say there are many differences between the NCAA eligibility rules and those of the women's organization. I have these charted but, of course, will not take the time to go into them. If you are interested in hearing some of these differences or if you know them, you will recognize the problem we have at this point.

Resolution No. 326 pledges to the women we will not go into any championship meets or tournaments for female student-athlete participation prior to 1977-78. Again, this was done in order to give the committee time to work out some kind of compromise or agreement, perhaps, with respect to national championships.

The resolution does not speak to this point, but earlier in the report you will recall that the possibility of unofficial or pilot co-educational championships was suggested. This is to be explored by the joint committee. This means a true co-educational type of competition, rather than women appearing on certain men's teams.

There could be a co-ed volleyball tournament, there could be a mixed-doubles kind of tennis tournament. This is the sort of thing that is being proposed and perhaps move us easily into the championship areas for women.

The final resolution calls for the establishment of an official committee on women's athletics with a subcommittee which would continue the activity upon which the present joint committee has embarked. December 30, Carol Mabrey, the president of the women's organization, sent to you a statement about the NCAA's position, and I should like to indicate what her recommendations are on these three resolutions.

She believes that Resolution No. 325 should be withdrawn or de-

feated because she thinks it is an unwise resolution and has not yet been adequately resolved. However, she believes that Resolution No. 326 is supportive of the joint committee recommendations and by implication should be adopted.

The same thing is true of Resolution No. 327. She supports the continuation of the joint committee effort to bring the two organizations into closer alignment. The two areas in which this joint committee proposes to continue to work are the area of our eligibility rules to bring some kind of commonality to these rules, and, further, investigation of possible committee and organizational realignments.

Mr. Orwig: Now, we will call upon legal counsel who are here to express opinions from the legal standpoint and perhaps verify some of the things contained in the legal brief which you already have received.

Our first legal speaker is Mr. Philip Brown, who is a member of the Washington law firm of Cox, Langford & Brown, which has represented the NCAA in the various legislative problems in the Congress of the United States.

Philip Brown: I don't wish to bore you by trying to repeat everything in this opinion; but at the same time, I think since we have offered a 23-page opinion for your digestion, it might be useful if we at least summarize the principal points.

I am sure we have a second crack orally at getting across the main arguments of this document that have been submitted in writing. At the beginning, it may be useful to know that we are required here to get into a discussion of Federal cases interpreting the Constitution, and specifically the provisions of the 14th Amendment, because of the court decisions in which the NCAA has been found to be the equivalent of its state.

In other words, since the NCAA membership is made up of roughly half of the institutions which are state institutions, the NCAA has been viewed by Federal Courts as an arm of the state, as something other than a private, voluntary association. It is not simply a private club or a private non-profit organization dealing with some aspect of educational interests.

It is an arm of the state and, therefore, is subject to the restrictions which the Constitution and the laws of the United States imposed upon state actions. It is for that reason that we were required at the outset, after we defined the legal principles involved, to get into the discussion of equal protection. The 14th Amendment requires the equal protection of the laws which forbids any state denying equal protection of the laws to anyone.

In discussing that, we were required to give you a little bit of the legal language of the two-tiered approach that has been followed by the Federal Courts. The courts have drawn a distinction in different kinds of cases the criteria which will be applied in determining whether a rule or practice, or whatever does constitute a violation of the equal protection of the laws.

We note that the basic test is the rational basis test. For example, that came up in the court cases in which the application of the NCAA rules was being challenged as a violation of the constitutional rights of the individual, as constituting a violation of antitrust laws and so

forth. We have been involved in several of those cases and in every single one the NCAA has won every issue, with the single exception of the alien student rule which in the Howard case was held to be illegal because it discriminated against aliens.

This rational basis was the test applied in most of those cases. It was found that the rules of the NCAA did have a rational basis, were reasonable in the application to the situations at hand; and therefore, the arguments raised by the individuals or institutions against them were not persuasive.

There is a second category, a category of cases involving issues affecting race, alienage or national origin, where a stricter standard is applied. A strict judicial scrutiny is applied because those areas are considered in areas of suspect classification. In other words, the courts are saying if you are going to get into issues involving alienage and national origin, we are very suspicious from the very outset and we are going to demand the most thorough analysis to be sure that the rule meets the strict judicial scrutiny necessary that we will apply.

Now, the point of giving you this dichotomy at the beginning is to say that even though this is developing a field of the law, and it is by no means finished in its development. Even though at the outset the rational basis test seems to be the only test applied by the courts in looking at the constitutionality of the rules of the NCAA, in other cases, not involving us but involving other parties, other issues, the question of whether sex discrimination should be treated the same way and what issues arising under that question should be subject to this very strict test, has been given more attention by the courts all the time, to a point where, while it is not a majority view of the Supreme Court—it lacks only one judge—four judges have said that on issues of sex discrimination the same very strict test should be applied as is applied in race or alienage.

If one other judge had agreed and that had become the law of the land, I would point out that that would be such a severe criteria that it would add still additional weight to the conclusions of this opinion, because it would seem to make it all the more difficult for any rule or practice which appear to constitute sex discrimination to be found to be constitutional.

We go on in discussing this criterion and get into cases involving de facto discrimination and other cases involving sex discrimination in athletics specifically; and we discuss the separate but equal issue which, as you know, has arisen in cases involving education, the segregation cases. It has been an issue in Title IX and an issue, I am sure, in the matters that are before you here.

We conclude that while we think the NCAA can discriminate between athletes on the basis of sex, where such action is reasonable and not arbitrary and where it rests upon some ground of difference, having a fair and substantial relation to a legitimate purpose, and that is the prevailing test.

It is our opinion that classifications based upon sex may not legally be applied in the NCAA rules, except in those unusual circumstances where separate or different treatment can be shown to be oriented toward the achievement of the substantial and legitimate purpose such as the minimization of physical injury or, as in one case, the

provision of equal opportunity, in fact, where it did not previously exist.

Differences in philosophy or tradition or in administration expediency will not justify race or sex treatment. We point out true equality can only be provided by starting with the premise that the student-athlete, regardless of sex, must in every case be treated in the same way; and under this premise we think that very few provisions of the NCAA Constitution and Bylaws can *prima facie* be read applying to other than male and female students alike.

Stated another way, we believe it is not constitutional for the NCAA as a state, which it is according to the courts, to adopt a general statement of principle in its organic documents to the effect which would be to exclude females from their application.

Now, I have noted that we have discussed certain exceptions to that, but that is our basic central conclusion. We stress this is an area of law that is continuing to develop. For example, there are lower Federal Courts which have looked at what the Supreme Court has done, have gone further, have supplied the strict scrutiny test as already been approved by the Supreme Court.

We point out that Title IX is on the books. Title IX is going to be five years old this year. The Title IX regulations are, of course, much younger. We have some differences, legally speaking, with the Title IX regulation. Unless a challenge were taken to court and unless and until that challenge were to be victorious, Title IX is a valid and effective law and the regulations are in effect.

All of this gives further reinforcement, in our view, to the conclusions we arrived at in this opinion.

Mr. Orwig: I should like to present to you Mr. George Gangwere, who is a member of the Kansas City firm of Swanson, Midgley, Gangwere, Thurlo & Clarke, who are the attorneys for the NCAA. George will discuss the application, in his opinion, of the resolutions which were read by Mr. Betz.

George Gangwere: If you have read the opinion and listened to Phil Brown, I think you know that it is established clearly by the cases at this point that neither the NCAA nor its members may freely discriminate on the basis of sex in the applications of its rules or in their operation.

Furthermore, you can gather from the legal opinion that there may be some affirmative obligation on the part of the NCAA to establish additional opportunities for women student-athletes. There isn't a definite and clearly affirmative obligation, but at least it appears in the cases that would be a very wise thing to do in order to avoid the possibilities of *de facto* discrimination.

If these things are true as legal counsel believes they are, then the first step is to determine what basic rules are going to apply to women student-athletes. To affirmatively state that the NCAA rules shall not apply to women, shall merely apply to men, would, in our opinion, constitute a discriminatory act in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, for the reason that such an action would not be related to a substantial and legitimate purpose but would be merely done, in fact, to deprive women student-athletes of the benefits of the NCAA organization.

It is the thrust of the legal opinion in this respect that the best

course of action from a legal standpoint is to apply the basic NCAA rules equally to all student-athletes. You may ask, "Why should we do this now? We have gone along these many years doing nothing."

The fact is that we have an ambiguous situation at the present time. The NCAA rules, that is the Constitution and Bylaws, by their terms do not discriminate by sex. They apply to all intercollegiate athletes and do not discriminate between male and female.

Yet, they are not enforced in that manner. There are many new women's teams being developed and the members of the NCAA do not know whether the NCAA rules apply or not. As I understand it, some members are applying the NCAA rules to women's teams. Others are not.

We have an ambiguous situation, and it should be cleared up. Furthermore, if there is some obligation to provide opportunities, additional opportunities for women, then it seems to me that that cannot be done by the NCAA unless the rules are made to apply to women. Unless that is done, the benefit of the NCAA organization will not be made applicable to women. There will be no means by which the NCAA would afford additional opportunities.

Finally, the surest way to avoid discrimination problems, of course, is to have the same basic rules for all students. When different rules for women student-athletes are permitted to develop, then there may well be conflicts in the rules, so that it is quite possible that we will have a threat to the continued liability of the NCAA rules as they now apply to men.

You might wonder how serious that threat is, because in the legal opinion there is an indication that you may have different rules in favor of women and they may be constitutional where that discrimination in favor of women is designed to correct an existing discriminatory situation.

So, in all cases you can't say that the male student-athlete would have a good discrimination case where the rules favor women. On the other hand, not every discrimination in favor of women could be sustained by that kind of reasoning. It seems to me it would be very difficult to sustain basic eligibility rules which, for example, would permit women professionals to compete as student-athletes but not men. Another example might be to permit women who don't meet the 2.0 rule to compete, whereas men could not. Thus, it is our view, that if the women's programs are permitted to develop without the application of coordinated similar rules to their programs, that there is a definite threat to the continued application of the NCAA rules.

Mr. Orwig: We are now open for discussion and questions.

Charles Young (UCLA): I am chancellor at UCLA. I should like to ask questions of counsel. I believe it will be impossible for me to do this without some reference to our own situation, but it is really by way of trying to get information.

We have at UCLA in accordance, I believe, with the NCAA policies and procedures an intercollegiate athletic program which is not a men's program. This is an intercollegiate athletic program. It is open to women on the same basis as it is to men in terms of the rules and regulations that apply.

We also have a women's sports program, which is an affirmative

action program, in which programs are operated in sports where women would not be able to compete at the present time. Of course, as long as that would be the case in competition with men in the normal arrangement now, it seems to me that that meets the requirement of the institution and we had so ascertained with the appropriate Federal agencies as far as our institution was concerned.

It seems to me that situation, insofar as the NCAA is concerned, is an appropriate one as well. We are not discriminating against women or the NCAA is not discriminating against women athletes that participate in programs that come under its jurisdiction.

Now, in the Resolution No. 325, the "whereas" clause indicates that it would be that, an affirmative act by amendment or interpretation of the NCAA Constitution and Bylaws to exclude or exempt women's varsity intercollegiate athletics would be invalid and that women participating in the intercollegiate athletics come under the jurisdiction of the NCAA in the same way as do men.

The definition that is set forth in paragraph 2 of the Resolution No. 325, in the "resolved" part, seems to me to be the one that creates the problem. You are now defining all of the women's programs so that they come within the jurisdiction of the NCAA in addition to women's participation in the regular NCAA program.

I guess the question is, isn't it possible to allow women's sports programs to operate outside the NCAA? Wouldn't this be legally possible, as long as the NCAA is open to participation by women and that women so participating operate within the same rules and regulations as do men?

Mr. Gangwere: If I understand the question, I think it would be legally possible to permit an exception to the definition of varsity intercollegiate athletic programs that would permit some women's teams to compete outside the NCAA rules. As a matter of fact, this was discussed one time in the joint committee gathering, and was concluded that if we divide the intercollegiate athletics so that the school would have an option to operate a women's program under some department other than the normal department which operated the general intercollegiate program of that institution, that would be some sort of a compromise.

The theory would be that the NCAA was making available, to present to its organization and its rules, to all the members, each member, would have an option to determine that some aspects of the women's programs would not be subject to regulations by NCAA rules. We don't think that is a very desirable approach because, after all, all of these people are students at one university; and where you have different rules, then there are changes that conflict and discrimination problems will exist. In the situation we were talking about, it would appear to be a problem of the individual institution and not that of the NCAA.

James Drinnon (University of Tennessee, Chattanooga): Is the issue not, in fact, whether the NCAA, as seems to be required by the individual institution of Title IX, will offer opportunities for women athletes participating in the championships as an affirmative action kind of approach to providing opportunities for women athletes?

I think it is fairly obvious that in NCAA events, there are very few women who have had an opportunity to participate. We have

in the past had, I guess, a lady tennis player who participated; but is that not really the issue that we are dealing with, whether the NCAA should or should not offer championships for women's teams?

Mr. Orwig: I don't believe for this particular time. We declared a moratorium on that until 1977. That might be something in the future, as I understand it.

Mr. Brown: The question, as I understand it, is how the NCAA must view the applications of the rules and what duties, if any, does it have to move forward in order to comply with the developing constitutional requirements. We said we felt that since the rules do not exclude women, since under these rules women are competing in sports and even in some championships that are mixed, we believe the rules must be construed as applicable to women as well as men.

Secondly, in answer to the second question, as to whether there are obligations on the NCAA to meet the constitutional requirements, we have said we think there are such obligations and even, if there hasn't been a specific law passed that details exactly what they are or a court decision as yet that details what they are, the elaboration of the constitution requirements applicable to the states and state actions are very clear.

The direction they are moving is very clear. The choice of either being pushed into it or moving along and doing what the courts are continuing to require of states is the underlying issue. You can paraphrase whether that also means offering more competition, because Title IX is premised, as you indicate, under the assumption that inadequate competition for women was the status quo and that the amendment to the Education Amendments Act of 1972, which is Title IX, says that you cannot discriminate against women in education, and the educational program receiving Federal funds must deal with the acts evenhandedly.

That is a consequence. I wanted to be specific as to the issues.

Mr. Betz: When NCAA rules are applied to women athletes, it would seem to me that we are obliged to offer national championships. Otherwise, the women would not be receiving equal opportunity, equal protection of the law.

Celeste Ulrich (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): First of all, I should like to say, along with many of you, I am a delegate to this Convention and, therefore, wear two hats. One, my hat is protect the business interest of the University of North Carolina in the collegiate athletic arena; and the second hat is that to try, to the best of my ability, to help to bring to the United States of America collegiate sports picture a degree of sanity, a degree of equality and a degree of reason.

As I have listened to the counsel and have read the legal opinions, I have in my hand at the present time two legal opinions that are diametrically opposed. One is from the law firm we have heard, and the second is from the law firm of Renouf, McKenna and Polivy. I know that most of us that have dealt with legal counselors know that as many law firms as there are in the United States, there would be that many legal opinions.

Consequently, really and truly, the only way in which we ever

have to find out what, indeed, is the law is ultimately to resort to litigation. All of us deplore having to do that. It is expensive and time consuming and certainly involves a great deal of energy. Yet, in terms of sex discrimination, ultimately, I think that we are going to have to turn to the courts to try to find out what is the position and the posture of our government regarding discriminatory practices.

As I have listened to the counselors, I understand from the law there are two ways in which the suits regarding discriminatory sex discrimination have been approached. One is the operation basis, the other involves some compelling reason.

The courts have taken the position, as I have read the cases, that if there are indeed two parties similarly situated, there is compelling reason they should be treated alike. If, indeed, there is a rationale basis for that, they should be treated alike.

As I have read the AIAW statement that was sent to me as a delegate to this Convention, it would appear to me that there are some compelling reasons why the male and female athlete are not similarly situated. I would call to your attention that women's athletics have been organized since the 1890's.

They have apparently been able to run efficiently. From what I understand, there are a number of women hence who do not consider somehow or another it would be delightful to have the benefits of the NCAA. I, therefore, like many of you, would want to try to do the best thing that we can in this country for athletes as a whole, both men and women.

If the best thing is to try to make it possible for men and women to have like opportunities, not necessarily organized and administered by one body, I should like to support that. If, indeed, that separation makes for inequality in opportunity, then I certainly do not want that to occur.

The question I should like to ask our legal counsel here is, as I have read the statement from AIAW, I read that there had been some attempt to seek a declaratory judgment, which is a friendly suit of the AIAW and NCAA. It asks the courts, if, indeed, this problem appeared—the difference between men and women's athletics programs—how would they be administered and how would the court look at this?

As I read what counsel said, there seems to be some reason why it was decided that the declaratory judgment was not a very feasible way in which to approach this particular issue. I should like to, if you would, sir, if the counselors would, one of them, speak to that point and tell me, explain to me why a declaratory judgment was decided to be a disadvantage at this time.

Mr. Brown: It is impossible, as though it may be for you to believe it. I think it is the second occasion I have had to address this organization and recommend that it not bring a lawsuit which would provide legal fees for lawyers.

That is because we believe the law is reasonably clear. We believe that the risk of other lawsuits forcing action by the NCAA of the type we are recommending is very clear, and we think it is unnecessary to take the declaratory judgment course and add to the burden of cost, already quite substantial, which has been carried by this organization in defending litigation in recent years.

Chairman Marshall (South Dakota State University): There will be an opportunity in the divisional round tables to continue the discussion. The legal counsel will go to those round tables. I apologize to the reorganization and classification committee for cutting in on their time. In order to conserve time, I will introduce the chairman, Ed Sherman; and we will get under way.

Edgar Sherman (Muskingum College): After the 1973 Special Convention, the Reorganization Committee felt that its work was completed and rejoiced. You can see that has not been the case, because today we have a panel to explain some new amendments that we are going to present to you tomorrow.

At this time, I would like to introduce the panel to you; and I will not make any further introductions. They will follow in the order I introduce them. Ralph Fadum will represent the Council and tell you why the Council adopted the proposals of the Committee. Ed Steitz will speak for the Executive Committee. Wiles Hallock will talk to you about the interim classification and Seavers Peters will present the Television Committee viewpoint of the reorganization.

We also have two source people at the end to help us with questions in case we need them. In May 1975, the Council asked the Reorganization Committee to reconvene and to review a number of developments related to reorganization. It charged us with the job of trying to make some recommendations that might add to the solution of these problems. Some of these developments were as follows:

(1) Institutions were continuing to change divisions in substantial numbers and, in fact, there were 67 changes made from August 1973, to May 1975.

(2) The Council was presented with the petitions from several conferences seeking to be reclassified from Division I as separate groups, although collectively none of the conferences met the criteria for Division I.

(3) The number of members in Division I, in the sport of football, increased from 121 at the time of reorganization to 137 at the present. It was found that many recent petitioners did not list a single opponent which was in Division I five years ago.

(4) The acceleration of Division I members in football concerned the Television Committee, since under the criteria of guarantying the appearances of the series would be diluted by requiring presentations of less attractive games, thus dictating a more restrictive football plan because of economic necessity.

(4) There were contentions to the Council by emerging Division II members that the old football classification system and the resultant reorganization grandfathered into Division I football a number of institutions which do not merit the designation based on present performance.

(6) In all of this was the broad commitment to attempt to provide the bona fide applicant to achieve the division of his choice. The often heard argument that reorganization guarantees freedom of choice, of course, is in error. The opportunity to establish criteria destroyed that argument.

Some institutions argued they should have the opportunity to choose whatever division they wished for their programs. Others argued that such freedom hinged upon their rights to self-determine

the divisions to which they would like to belong. This led for the decision of the decision making process to solve the conflicting freedom of choice which different members wished to exercise.

Member classification and the grouping of institutions within the NCAA has always been a continuing problem. It should be pointed out that the classification for statistical purposes was originated by writers' organizations. They were determined based primarily on strength of schedule which institutions would be eligible in football and basketball.

Later these distinctions began to be used for other purposes, most notably for guarantying the members of certain conferences appearance on television series. Finally, then, the NCAA division championship competition was created, permitting an institution to participate on the basis of self-determination, except in the sport of football.

Self-determination never was applied to football. Even before reorganization in 1974, the emergence of certain state universities concurrent with the decline of some traditional football programs, led to the request for a change in the major classification system.

However, in the process of reorganization, the Classification Committee was eliminated and criteria for the divisional member was incorporated into the Bylaws. It should be pointed out that one of the problems was the failure of the division to create its own criteria as quickly as possible.

With the above background in mind, the Reorganization Committee proposed to the Council for its approval the plan for classification and re-classification, and for the further reorganization of the Association. The Council has received the committee's recommendation and the following amendments will be proposed for action.

If you would like, I will group them as I give them. Nos. 223 and 232 relate to the creation of a Classification Committee with authority to apply association approved criteria in determining the membership division of new and continuing members, appeal procedures, provide a rehearing process before the Committee and an appeal hearing before the Council.

All Council actions are subject to Convention review. Thus, an ultimate rehearing would be available before the Convention. The present procedures do not provide for formal education processes in determining whether a member qualifies for a particular division.

The establishment of a continuing Classification Committee is intended to fill that void. No. 227 deals with the inauguration of a probationary process, whereby a member desiring to be placed in a particular division for which it may not be qualified at present, can be accorded temporary divisional membership by the Classification Committee.

Now, we will go to No. 226. That deals with the establishment of criteria to be utilized by the Classification Committee in evaluating requests for change of division. It has nothing to do, incidentally, with the establishment of I or I-A.

No. 225 gives authorization for the Classification Committee to conduct an immediate review of the divisional membership classification of each member to be effective after allowing for a rehearing and appeals August 1, 1976.

Nos. 230 and 231 deal with requirements that applicants for Division I membership must meet the football and basketball scheduling requirements at the time of the application to adjust the minimum scheduling requirements for member institutions of conferences.

There will be two ways to go. You can go up immediately with both going with the proper qualifications, or have the five-year grace period.

Nos. 234 and 236 deal with the creation of four divisions for the sport of football to be known as Divisions I, I-A, II and III. Division I-A must be a member of Division I for other purposes.

In summary, this program is designed to meet these needs: (a) a standing committee to confirm the divisional membership classifications of the members and act upon request for transfer of divisional memberships and monitor the adherence of members to their divisional requirements; (b) create a probationary mechanism which should benefit institutions desiring to change divisions, establish criteria other than strength of schedule to be used by the Classification Committee in determining the merits of application for transfer; (c) provide for four divisions in football in order to more nearly accommodate the different levels of football programs within the division, and (d) to establish a formal appeal process for institutions which desire a divisional membership classification which they believe is being denied them for invalid reasons.

It should be noted that each amendment, I believe it is down to eight now, which the Reorganization Committee and Council are jointly proposing, should each be considered on its individual merits. It is not intended to be presented as a package, but rather to fill some of the voids that have occurred as a result of our original reorganization of legislation.

Ralph Fadum (North Carolina State University): I have been asked by the Council to discuss its reasoning in proposing to the Convention the recommendations of the Reorganization Committee as set forth in the proposals just described by Ed Sherman.

As a preamble to my brief discussion, I want to make it clear that we in the Council consider it our primary responsibility to seek to identify issues that appear to be of concern to our membership, to develop legislative proposals relating to them and to seek to explain the implication of these proposals so that the membership of the Association can decide how intercollegiate athletics are to be governed.

It is the purpose of the Council to assist the members of the association to achieve their purposes. The purpose of reorganization which was initiated, as Ed said, in the First Special Convention held in Chicago in 1973, is to provide a means for those institutions which share a common philosophy, purpose and interest, to develop appropriate legislation to accomplish their objectives.

Reorganization must be a continuing process to keep abreast of continual changes. The changes which have occurred since 1973, some 67 in number, have prompted the Reorganization Committee to propose additional changes relating to reorganization that are embodied in the nine proposals just described by the chairman of the Reorganization Committee.

The Council very carefully has reviewed these recommendations

and proposals relating to them are presented with the hope that improvements can be made to enable those institutions which share common purposes to accomplish their objectives.

The Council would like to direct its attention to several matters. One, the reorganization calling for a Division I-A in football is intended to provide better opportunities for some members in Division I and some members in Division II, which may constitute the new Division I-A if it is established, to have a better opportunity to participate in the television program. The chairman of the Television Committee, Seaver Peters, will, in due course, discuss this matter.

Two, the members of I-A will be given assurances that the Executive Committee will support the establishment of a football championship for this division should it desire to have one.

This will, in due course, be discussed by Ed Steitz of our Executive Committee. I want to reiterate what Ed Sherman has said, because I think this is a very important point. Each of the proposals should be considered on its own merit. That is, the passage or the defeat of one will not affect any of the other proposals before you.

For example, there is a need in the minds of some for the establishment of a Classification Committee, whether there should be instituted a fourth division in football. The resolution authorizing immediate review of the membership is thought to be necessary, whether there is a new division established in football, and so on.

There are two related proposals that are coming at the very end, No. 234, which establishes I-A, and No. 236, which establishes the criteria for I-A, should it be established. I shall come to those in just one moment.

I wish to report that the Council in its review of the reorganization classification has found in its very extensive deliberations that the interim classification was not able to receive and hear all appeals, and because of the possible misinterpretation of the interim committee sample listing and the lack of equitable opportunity for appeals, the Council re-emphasizes that the classification listing is a sample only.

The Council has neither approved nor accepted it. Further, the permanent Classification Committee, should it be established, will be instructed accordingly. As a final comment, and this relates to Proposal No. 236 which would establish criteria for Division I-A in the event it was established, the Council will seek to withdraw or table this amendment. Inasmuch as I-A, to which it refers and which has not been yet constituted, should have a voice in establishing a membership criteria, this action would be consistent with the action recommended by the Reorganization Committee, which provides that each of the three divisions of the Association, that is the original three, should have the opportunity of establishing its own membership criteria.

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): I speak on behalf of the Executive Committee which feels these proposals are important since they will provide an opportunity for a member institution to realize national championships at a desired level more easily than now is the case.

If No. 222 were adopted, members of Divisions II and III could

compete in national championships in sports where only a single event is sponsored by the NCAA under the eligibility rules of their own division. I reiterate, under their own divisional eligibility rules.

This pertains to fencing, ice hockey, skiing, indoor track, volleyball and water polo.

This is an important accommodation between and among divisions. The Executive Committee feels a strength of Proposal No. 225 is the restriction that no member may be reclassified in the sport of football to a division of a lower number, such as from Division III to Division II, or to be reclassified to one they didn't care to be, from Division II to Division I.

Likewise, we feel it is appropriate in Proposal No. 227 that a probationary member may compete in the division it is seeking as soon as it meets the eligibility criteria of that division. If it is transferring, for example, from II to I. It seems inappropriate in such a case to deprive students championship opportunities while their institution fulfills the administrative requirements.

An institution would not be eligible during probation if a transfer from II to III. Concerning the proposal to create Division I-A, which is Proposal No. 234, as you well know, the Executive Committee foresees many benefits which would accrue to the program of those members which would be members of I-A.

If those institutions want it, the Executive Committee is prepared to sponsor a Division I-A football championship following the 1976 season. Its financing would be underwritten by the Association; and based upon the experiences of Division II and Division III, we can anticipate a very successful activity.

It is highly probable that the championship would be televised, bringing additional income and exposure to the football programs of these institutions. This should be a most attractive event for the members who currently cannot often participate with postseason football competition.

The Executive Committee is as pleased as the Council that these important proposals will be before the Convention delegates for consideration.

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference): I should like to re-emphasize one point at the outset. It has been dealt with by Ralph Fadum and Ed Sherman. Very early in the game, the Interim Classification Committee learned that no matter how many times it was emphasized that the Interim Classification Committee was just that, it somehow represented a brand or a kiss of death or a commitment to a permanent classification committee.

I think Ralph has stated the Council's position very well. I should again like to repeat that. This is an interim list. You have it as a handout. You have a very brief memorandum dated, I believe, January 8, which explains the formation of the Committee.

I would like to explain what has happened since the Committee was appointed. It was appointed as a result of the Council's early October action, on October 18. At that time, it was anticipated the Committee would have one face-to-face meeting, come up with an interim classification list, merely as a guideline in the construction of the reorganization legislation, and that list would be distributed to the membership at the time of the Convention Official Notice.

It was obvious if this were to be accomplished within the time frame of the Official Notice distribution, there would be no full blown hearings and that the personal knowledge of the individual members would be counted upon and previous experience of the members of the Committee who served on the Reorganization Committee and the TV Committee might provide enough expertise at least for an interim list.

You are aware, I believe, that both the Reorganization Committee and the TV Committee had for their own purposes drawn up earlier guideline lists independently of each other which were very similar, and that the problems of the Interim Classification Committee really would center on a relatively few conferences and institutions.

I would like to mention the members of the Committee at this point and if we don't have adequate opportunity to field questions, you, in your individual round tables, should have the opportunity to ask questions of the members in your division who were on that Interim Classification Committee.

I would like, also, to ask the members of that Committee if they disagree in any respect with the presentation that I am making, that they make that plain to their respective divisions and add to this presentation anything they feel pertinent to the interim classification list.

The Committee members are, from Division I, Ed Crowder, Colorado; C. D. Henry, the Big Ten; Jim Higgins, Lamar; Boyd McWhorter, Southeastern Conference Commissioner; Seaver Peters, Dartmouth, and Ed Saxer, University of Toledo and NCAA Council.

In Division II we had Howard Gentry, Tennessee State; Bob Latour, Bucknell; Lyle Smith, Boise State, and from Division III, George Hansell, Widener College; Ed Sherman, our Reorganization chairman, Muskingum College, and Ron Schipper, Central College of Iowa.

Our charge was to utilize the criteria recommended by the Reorganization Committee and endorsed by the Council to delineate strictly as guidelines four divisions in football. Our first decision was that no changes would be recommended between Divisions II and III, but that we would deal with movement between Divisions I and II in arriving at a classification of I, I-A and II.

We then decided, after considerable discussion, to consider classifications of conferences not by individual institutions, but strictly as conferences. Now, our criteria which we had to go by, the only criteria we were operating under, were the criteria as listed in Proposal No. 226.

Our original meeting on October 28 arrived at a list of 78 Division I institutions, 82 in I-A, which moved the Big Sky, Southland and Southwestern Conferences from Division II into I-A and the Ohio Valley into Division II. As you remember, this is just for football. We recognized difficult decisions within Division I in the case of Mid-American Conference, particularly, and with Louisville, Cincinnati, Rutgers, Temple, Southern Mississippi and North Texas State, individually.

These were the seemingly problem areas which the Interim Committee faced. Now, the Ohio Valley Conference had knottiest problems and was subject to the most discussion and reconsideration

during our meeting. I am sure that there was some anxiety, at least on my own part, about the ability of mere humans to act with absolute wisdom in these matters, not only in respect to Ohio Valley Conference, but in all these questionable matters.

The Ohio Valley Conference triggered the next decisions. Though the list was not distributed, to my knowledge, by anyone on the Committee or the Council or the staff, Ohio Valley was extremely distressed at being placed in Division II in football and appealed the decision. Again, I stressed to the commissioner, Paul Dietzel, that was not permanent and the Interim Committee would be fully informed of the depth of our discussion.

I conferred with Tom Hansen of the NCAA staff, and after considerable agonizing over the implications of hearing any appeals, it was decided that to deny an appeal process was more wrong than to draw the line at that point. Well, a Committee conference call resulted in a unanimous decision to reclassify the Ohio Valley Conference into I-A.

The officers acting for the Council then made the determination to present or permit the committee to review some other institutions, those other institutions or conferences about which there appeared some divided opinion as to their disposition. Well, this made the publication of the Interim Committee not feasible unless held up.

Only those members, and I stress this very carefully, only those members about which there was doubt on the part of the committee were notified of this avenue of appeal. There were appeals from five institutions. There were no conference appeals, and the committee determined that only those institutions which had appealed would be considered for reclassification.

Three of the five were reclassified in Division I. The Mid-American Conference, through its representative on the committee, Ed Saxer, served notice that Mid-American would appeal to the permanent committee on its classification. If reorganization is implemented, there will be other appeals fully documented with the committee and given greater time to consider them.

All of the discussion factors of the Interim Committee, I am certain, will be transferred to any permanent committee. As you can see by the list contained in the memorandum handed to you, the number of Division I institutions now stands at 81. Those in I-A would be 79 and the proposed Division II football list would be 111, if my count is correct.

There are a couple of duplication errors in transmission, not in action. On the Division II list, Eastern Michigan University should be stricken from that list, since it is a member of the Mid-American Conference. I believe that Arkansas State University, being a member of the Southland Conference, should be stricken from the Division II list.

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): As chairman of the Television Committee, I report to you that our Committee would have written into the new 1976-77 Plan some form of guarantee for the membership of Division I-A had that division been in existence at the time the plan was adopted. It chose not to simply to avoid becoming engaged in the business of reorganization at the time when the Reorganization Committee had not yet completed its work.

Should I-A be created, our Committee intends to negotiate with ABC and revise the Plan to provide some type of guarantee for Division I-A members. We have covered the contingency of the reorganization in our negotiations with ABC which, of course, ultimately sought the signing of a new contract with that network.

While the NCAA TV Committee can, in the best interest of inter-collegiate football, modify the plan, any change of a substantive nature must, of course, be approved by the Council. As to the possibility of a Division I-A football championship I would anticipate that the TV Committee would be consistent in their policy and require the carrying network to televise a Division I-A championship.

I mention consistent, in that we require the carrying network, ABC, to televise the Division III Championship and the Division II semi-finals and the Division II Football Championship final.

Chairman Marshall: Thank you for your patience. We will now move to the round tables.

[The session adjourned at 3:45 p.m.]

BUSINESS SESSION

Friday Morning, January 16, 1976

The business session of the 70th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order in the Illinois-Missouri-Meramec Rooms at 8:30 a.m. by NCAA President John A. Fuzak.

10. OPENING COMMENTS

President Fuzak: At each of the tables, the amendments to amendments have been placed. Eight are at each table. We do not have a surplus of these, so I urge you to keep the copy, your copy of the amendments to amendments. Once again, I ask those voting delegates or from voting institutions, voting organizations, and only those involved in arriving at legislative decisions to be in the front of the room. Otherwise, we ask visitors to seat themselves in the visitors section at the rear.

Once again, we have over 1,000 registered, and we do not have the exact count, but is a record. This is the largest registration that we have ever had in an NCAA meeting.

We have had 16 notifications of intentions to withdraw particular proposals. I will not go through them at this time, since the approval for withdrawal is necessary and we will take them up as we come to them.

In reference to your amendments to amendments, at the suggestion of one of our member institutions, we are using a different numbering system for amendments to amendments in this Convention. Each amendment to the amendment bears the same proposal number as the item it is to amend. You will notice on No. 100, on the first one on the amendments to amendments sheet, is No. 100-1. The next one is No. 100-2. Now, you can identify by looking at your sheet the proposal to which it relates. It is our hope that this system, rather than the customary sequential numbering system, will enable all of you to locate quickly your appropriate amendment to the amendment or proposal. Our voting procedure will be the same, that is, all vote by paddle.

All Bylaws will be by division. The common Bylaws require passage in each of the three divisions. Official Interpretations require majority vote of the divisions to which its Bylaw applies.

You may move to change the order of the Convention, and a two-thirds vote will be required to accomplish it. The first item of business is the conclusion of the Council Report. You may recall that Neils Thompson did not move adoption or approval of that report, so I will call on him for the conclusion of that Report.

11. ACCEPTANCE OF THE REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): First, Mr. Chairman, I should like to move on behalf of the Council the adoption by

this Convention of the Council's Report, and the Annual Reports which you have in your hand. Then I will have a further report.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

12. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Thompson: As an addition to the Council Report, I should like to call your specific attention to Resolution No. 225-1. It is the resolution on reorganization.

I am advised that we need a little editorializing this early in the morning. Late last evening it was missed. That should be Resolution 225-4, instead of 225-1. [See page A-135]

Further with particular attention to the note at the bottom, in conjunction with this particular resolution, this Convention, the Council will ask the Convention permission to withdraw Proposals Nos. 225, 234, 236 and 240. In addition, the topical heading of Proposal No. 226 is editorially altered to read "Membership Division—Guidelines" to more accurately reflect the intent of that proposal.

There is no action that needs to be taken at this time, but this report needed to come from the Council to the Convention.

Franklin A. Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): As chairman of the Division II Steering Committee, in view of the resolution that has just been proposed, I am announcing to Division II that we will not request a change in the agenda. This does not prohibit any member from Division II requesting this individually; but as a division, we will not request a change in the agenda.

Determination of Financial Need

Jack Larsen (University of Southern California): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded]

President Fuzak: I am remiss in not having said that I intend at this meeting to be sure that there is some discussion, or at least information about the main motion, before we move into the amendments to that motion. It seemed to me from our Special Convention too often there was little or no discussion concerning what the main motion meant, and we moved to the amendments to the amendments very quickly and caused some problems. Therefore, I am going to ask that this be done in each case where there is an amendment to the amendment. I am sorry to interrupt you, Jack, but I wanted to announce that to the Convention. You may proceed, please.

Mr. Larsen: Proposal No. 100 would amend Bylaw Article 5 which deals with limitations on financial aid in awards, to provide financial aid based on the need to the extent of the room and board at average campus rates, plus a book allowance. It would provide a formula for determining an expected family contribution to the financing of the education of the student-athlete, and it would provide for a system of monitoring said financial aid.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Convention, we have been directed by the Special Convention in August to develop such a proposition. We have drawn on the best thought that went into previously unsuccessful propositions. We believe this is eminently fair, given to times in which we are operating intercollegiate athletics, and we request your support for this proposal.

C. A. Bautz (Bloomsburg State College): I would hope you people

here would vote in opposition to this amendment. The simple reason is there is something which indicates where the NCAA Council will come up with forms for us to follow. The cost in additional secretary help, the cost in additional forms, is going to take up whatever you are going to save. That is number one.

Secondly, it is going to put the athlete at a disadvantage in comparison to other students at your institution. The third thing is, since when does the NCAA or a group such as this step in and dictate to the financial aid office in your institution, or to your state regulations, which might already stipulate what the need package is. For those reasons, I would hope you would all vote against this.

President Fuzak: I did not intend that we have a debate back and forth, but essentially an exposition of the meaning of the proposal that is before us, because that debate will come at the appropriate time in connection with the main motion. However, I don't mean to gag the members of the Convention. But in this case, the hope is to get a little better exposition and understanding.

Richard Lyman (Stanford University): I want to call your attention to paragraph (h) in No. 100, because I think there has been some misunderstanding on the point. If Proposal No. 100 is passed by all the divisions, any division may have recourse, as I would interpret that paragraph, to the scholarship formulas for determining financial need.

It will not substitute the NCAA formula for the CSS, because each institution, and obviously by extension and division, including many institutions, is free to apply its own need formula provided the awards are not greater than what would be under the NCAA formula that it would result in higher awards than this CSS formula does.

I further would like to suggest that there is an advantage for the entire Association if the entire Association moves to a basis in which student-athletes can no longer be described by the media and by many in our own campus public as being specially privileged, and a uniquely marked out group. They are students as well as athletes, and they will appear so unequivocally if we pass this resolution.

Charles Young (UCLA): On behalf of the Pac-8 Conference, I move No. 100-1 as an amendment to the motion before us.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a simple amendment. It would strike the words "NCAA, or its" in two places in the proposed Bylaw, which would leave the wording then, "the forms shall be submitted to the NCAA's designated agent." That is taking away the option of having this administered directly by the NCAA and providing instead there be a designated independent agent to which these financial need analysis forms shall be submitted and which would do the analysis and keep the information and give the data then back to the institutions that require it.

We believe that this would further guarantee the independence of the operation, that there are other agencies, such as the ETS and the ATC, for instance, which are set up to this kind of processing. We believe that it would be done easily, more efficiently and more independently in that manner.

Doug Weaver (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): Is not this amendment more restrictive?

President Fuzak: I believe that was considered and deemed not particularly to be so. Just a moment. I will check with the parliamentarian again. Our judgment is that it is not. We did discuss that at one point. Of course, there is the possibility, in the original, that it be done; and I guess we felt it was not significantly more restrictive.

Earl Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I request some information. Would the NCAA's administration of this program cost parents less than if the service was provided by the College Scholarship Service? What about the relative costs involved?

President Fuzak: I will have to ask some member of the committee which worked on the proposal that is before us, the main motion, to respond to that. I am unable to do that. Is Professor Sawyer here?

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): I am sorry to say we do not have cost figures on this.

William Baughn (University of Colorado): Will the students or the athletic department pay for this initial processing? That is, if a student has no family contribution, will the athletic department pay for the initial processing, or will the student have to pay for it?

Mr. Larsen: The initial processing, as I understand it, is the completion of the financial aid application form. Now, I do not understand the cost of completing this form. This would be similar to the parent's confidential financial statement completed for students in general, and there is a cost in time, of course, but out-of-pocket cost? I am not aware of anything, apart from mailing it.

Mr. Baughn: The earlier question implied that the student would pay for this process. Is that covered by NCAA overhead?

President Fuzak: I am sorry. We are really not addressing ourselves to the amendment to the amendment that is before us, Bill.

Mr. Baughn: Yes, I am. The question is related. Now, who does it? Do we do it, or is it done by an outside organization? The earlier question was whether or not it would cost the student more one way versus the other. I assume that the NCAA would take care of this overhead.

Mr. Sawyer: As far as the cost is concerned, you must keep in mind the parent's confidential form. Other similar services are designed to keep it to a minimum. The cost for participating in that is very low, some \$5 to \$10. In this particular case, the cost of filling out the form is simply the student's time.

The necessary computer cost might be 10 or 15 cents per application, plus postage or plus whatever clerical cost is involved in the NCAA or its agent. For an outside agency, some reasonable fee for their time; but we could not anticipate a really huge expense. That is one reason it has not been projected out to some flat fee.

[Proposal No. 100-1 (page A-131) was defeated by Division I, 102-121, and by Divisions II and III.]

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan): I would like to draw attention to the resolution that is labeled No. 100-2, which is sponsored by the University of Michigan. I should like to explain the purpose of it and why it is there.

The University of Michigan is not opposed to the need system as a matter of principle. We supported it in the Big Ten when we had it there. Neither does the University of Michigan believe that the

system is unadministrable as some people have claimed. The present plan, however, does not bring tuition within the scope of the need factor, and for that reason substantial doubt has been raised in the number of quarters with which I have had contact as to whether the plan, although in every other way is perfectly acceptable, will really save a great deal of money.

It will cost some money, and No. 100-2 proposes a resolution to have what might be called a dry run on the need system. As proposed by this plan, during the coming year all initial grants-in-aid, persons receiving initial grants-in-aid, are required to go through the process they would go through if No. 100 was passed, and each institution can determine from that data how much it would really save and then report this information to the NCAA Council. In October, or thereabouts, the Council can furnish the information without identifying institutions, to the membership so we will have a better basis for determining whether the time and trouble and expense of the need system, such as this, is worth the savings that would accrue to us.

That is our only purpose. We have no doubt about the principle, no doubt about the plan. The only question is with tuition excluded from need factor, will it save the money that would make it feasible? My vote is going to be to defeat No. 100 and then vote in favor of No. 100-2. I urge that you do give consideration to that.

Mr. Young: I wish to speak in support of No. 100. I believe this is an extremely important matter for this Convention and extremely important in my view, not because of the money that it would save—although I believe it is very clear that it will save money.

I think it might be useful if we had had the time prior to now to know by virtue of some procedures, such as that which is set forth in No. 100-2, exactly how much would be saved. But at least from where I sit and what I see of the current operation and its costs, I don't need such a study to tell me that the savings would be substantial.

As a matter of fact, I believe that the passage and implementation of No. 100 would save more than all of the other cost savings actions which have been taken combined. But even if it didn't save any money, I believe this is an extremely important piece of legislation for this Convention.

I believe it is extremely important because I believe it is essential for the preservation of the strong intercollegiate athletic programs which are the concern of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Increasingly, those of us who are responsible for the administration of the institutions which operate these programs, and I believe they are very vital to higher education, are under attack for one particular aspect of the intercollegiate athletic program. That is that the aid which is provided to the student-athlete is provided on a completely different basis than that for any other student in the institution.

What is being proposed here is not going to put the student-athletes on exactly the same basis as all other students in the competition for financial aid in these institutions. The basis is still very different. The formula is different. The method or the source of the funds is very different, and the kind of aid which would be

provided under this program is very different from that which is given to other students.

The financial aid package which is provided for other students following financial need analysis is a combination in almost every instance of work study program, of grants and a loan. We are talking here about grants-in-aid and we are talking here about grants-in-aid from funds provided through the athletic program.

We are talking about grants-in-aid up to the maximum, which would be allowed under the formula which is provided. Again, in most of our institutions, other students get far less financial aid than this entitlement will allow under the need formula. I believe this is an extremely important item, as I have indicated, not merely for the economic factors involved, but because a move in this direction is vitally needed for the preservation and protection and continued strengthening of the intercollegiate athletic programs of this country. I, therefore, urge you to vote in support of No. 100.

Mr. Plant: I would point out in response to Charles Young's remarks there is still a substantial difference between the athletic and non-athletic. As long as the tuition factor is not put under the need system, the distinction between the athlete and non-athlete is important. That distinction will continue to exist under this.

Victor Buccola (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo): Since we do have equivalencies in various courses, you don't base your number of scholarships on the number of individuals. If scholarships are based on need instead of giving them to, say, 30 people, you can spend the same amount of money giving them to 70 individuals. I don't believe that it will be any help financially if you spend the same amount. You will be distributing it to more individuals.

Lavon McDonald (University of New Mexico): I rise to speak against No. 100 for several reasons. I have a question, also. I wonder if the committee checked with HEW on the need basis. In informal talks with the American Financial Aid Office, the indication from HEW is that if the NCAA goes to the need basis they must provide the total need, not an amount designated by the NCAA.

Again, we probably would be in trouble as we are with Title IX. Also, in following the Higher Education Act of 1965, immediately 70 per cent of the student population of the colleges and universities in this country became independent or emancipated students. You can get a \$750 deduction for a child, or he can receive \$3,500.00 aid as an independent student. This is what happens.

I feel that in this country it is a sad state when young people cannot receive aid on the basis of excellence instead of welfare. [Applause]

Mr. Larsen: No, we did not have legal guidance on the concept drafted in No. 100. I think everything we do in society today is susceptible to someone's interpretation, whether it is legal or not. If we cannot take action without having a battery of legal counsel, we will come to a screeching halt here.

Our committee felt, after due deliberation, that this is eminently fair, given the removal of tuition and mandatory fees, which are the major variable in the package of financial aid given by our member institutions. One other answer to a previously raised ques-

tion, what is the cost to the prospective student athlete?

Paragraph (i) provides that the Council may fix fees for supplying forms and so forth. I have the assurance of a member of the Council that this would not be an onerous fee, that before the fee became onerous, it would be absorbed by the NCAA. One further remark which I wish to clarify, which may not be clear, the Council, the NCAA Council, does not take a position on this proposal. It serves only as the device to get it before the floor under the direction of the August Special Convention.

Joseph Geraud (University of Wyoming): The statement was made earlier that if this formula was adopted, it would be putting the athletes in the same position as all other students on campus. I would hope, as you all check with your own financial aid officers, the present need factor, I am certain, on most all campuses, is in excess of that which would be permitted under the NCAA plan.

There is a cost of living allowance included, the cost of travel is included. If you are going to have a need formula, it ought to be the same for all students and not limited to fees and board and room. How it will balance totally on the cost factor, I don't know. I think that is why No. 100-2 is a very significant matter to be considered at this time, but I would urge all of you to consider the factor that this is not the same need program that all other students are under who have a real financial need.

A. A. White (University of Houston): I am against No. 100. I should like to say briefly my reasons. First, I think it would add just one more cause of dissention on a squad. Secondly, it adds a major opportunity for fraud, which has been true of all programs of this general type. Third, it is an indirect form of scholarship reduction. It is a dilution or watering down of the talent pool from which you can seek to attract student-athletes with full scholarships. Fourth, it confuses the philosophy of scholarships. There are two basic types of scholarships. The first is given to the recipient to help him or her accomplish what he or she wants. It is primarily for the recipient's benefit. It is a form of charity. Her need may be a controlling factor. The second is given by the donor to draw the recipient to the donor to enable the donor to accomplish some objective it has. It may be a great debater, a news genius or a great athlete. I am certain that every institution of higher education in this group has administered by its institutions scholarships that are given for the purpose of drawing people to that university for the purpose of accomplishing something which that university wished to accomplish.

It is in no sense an act of charity. In this category, the donor is the controlling factor, not that of the recipient. When we mix the two, we are in some measure mixing two inconsistent ideas. I recognize this program or at least I will concede this program may accomplish some sort of savings.

But I think when we reach the point that additional savings has to be accomplished, and we may be there, that it will be accomplished by a more direct and more frontal attack.

Phillip Shriver (Miami University, Ohio): I rise to speak in favor of this resolution and for these reasons. First, I call your attention to the fact there is a blend in this proposition of both merit and

need. There is merit in the form of the fees needed in relation to room and board.

Secondly, I call the attention of every institution here to the fact that you are under a mandate, a mandate to respond to Title IX within a three-year period. Each one of us does not see a major source of new dollars on the horizon. We have to be in compliance within three years. I think everyone would agree there is merit in Title IX.

We want to be in compliance, and we shall be. In the absence of new sources of funding for the next three years, we have got to begin to make some significant economic advances. This started out in August as a Convention to achieve these. We are now here in January, and a significant advance has not yet taken place.

I do believe that each of us must be mindful if we have in prospect Federal and state dollars on the basis of need to all our students if we take advantage of these. I think that Chancellor Young's observations were very much in order. I believe every president here would echo his sentiments.

Joseph Reitz (Stanford University): As a matter of institutional principle since Stanford has been in existence, we have required every student-athlete to fill out a parent's confidential statement. Even though we do not apply that formula to his need, we ask that he fill it out. That is, he gets the full ride. I have made a study of the dollar impact this would have on our particular program. Our scholarship program is based on gift funds coming to the university, as many are here, and have found if this formula or a formula excluding tuition were applied to the figures that we have on our student-athletes, there would be about 145 in 13 sports receiving some kind of aid, and we would save \$150,000.

If we applied the full parent's confidential statement, including tuition to it, the cost savings is in the neighborhood of \$400,000. This is a very large amount in terms of our institution. We may be different as a private institution in many ways than the type of students that you do have in terms of need.

At least this factual data is important for everyone to understand. There were a couple of points raised by the previous speakers that I think need some answering. One had to do with the declaring of the student's independent status. I presume this does go on on an occasional basis in many institutions. I have made a little study with our financial aids officers as to how these are handled. He tells me that the U.S. Office of Education has three criteria a student must meet in order to claim independent status. One is, the parents must not have claimed the student on their income tax return as a dependent for the previous taxable year. This usually requires the parent send his IRS form as conformation.

Proof must be made that the parent did not contribute more than \$600 toward the student's support the previous year, and it must be proved that the student had not lived with his parents for more than a two-week period during the previous year. I assume these are submitted to all students and have to be applied to athletes.

I would assume that if all of the athletes of every institution claimed independent status, it would put the universities in a rather significant deleterious position because there is really no way

whereby any student on that campus might claim the same privilege, in which case you would have tremendous financial problems at your university. I think we are talking about individuals, rather than totals.

Edward Czekaj (Pennsylvania State University): I speak in behalf of the 30 major independent Division I football schools. We had a meeting Tuesday, and it was the unanimous position of this group to oppose this legislation. We firmly believe in granting aid based on athletic ability and not on need. We have lived with this philosophy a long time. It is a good philosophy and we prefer to keep it that way.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): We have heard administrators of universities say this morning that we have to save money and athletic administrators say we should give scholarships, too, on the basis of merit. I am not going to talk on whether the need is good or bad, but this proposal is bad. It is bad because it discriminates against the applicant. If you look at paragraph (c) of your proposal, the presidents have said we are trying to put the athletes back in the same position with the rest of our students. But under paragraph (c), we grant any type of athletic scholarship, we deny the athlete the privilege of working to save any money he receives, or money from his parents.

I would like to speak for the group that has not been heard here, the student-athlete. This particular proposal discriminates against him. It is a combination, as one president said, of merit, of need and of discrimination. I would urge you to defeat this proposal and possibly adopt what Mr. Plant would like, but at least at this time to defeat the proposal that is before you.

Lloyd Watkins (West Texas State University): I came to this Convention more than anything else to see what could be done as we face the future with regard to cost. I do not believe I can put the case for this particular motion better than it has been put by Chancellor Young or by President Shriver. I agree with them.

I believe that it would be possible to take this proposal and then pick it to death. I believe you can find something wrong with every proposal laid before us if you wished to do so. I submit to you that analogous with regard to students in other areas, such as debate merit scholarships and the merit scholarships given athletes are not particularly impressive when you compare the amounts.

I know I have a kid that is a very good one and he got exactly nothing for his efforts. I think that the time has come when we need to take a look at the financial implications of our student aid package. I think the time has come when we are going to have to do that, whether we want to or not.

It is rather like the position in one of the commercials, we can either buy it now or buy it later. I urge all of you to consider that when a president takes the time or a chancellor takes the time to get involved, it is not because he is opposed to athletics. It may be that he is willing to take a week out of his busy schedule, because he believes enough in them that he fears the possibility of athletic enterprise on his or other campuses going away on the back of the dinosaur, that they are becoming so burdensome that there is no way further to keep financing it.

We have ignored, as President Shriver has said, the implications of Title IX, the financial implications of it, throughout the Convention. We have rather taken the attitude, I think, that it will go away if we just don't talk about it. I do not believe that is the case. I want, therefore, to urge your support of this.

I believe that if there are problems involved in the administration of this program, those problems can be worked out by men and women of good will. I see no insurmountable barriers to the proposed legislation.

Glenn Terrell (Washington State University): I don't know whether this body can hear another president or chancellor speak on this or any other issue; but I feel compelled to do so, nevertheless.

I happen to be chairman of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. At the call of the president of the association, we had a meeting of all the presidents and chancellors who were here Tuesday evening to discuss primarily our role in the National Collegiate Association, our role as presidents and chancellors, and also, to discuss how costs can be reduced and how revenues can be increased.

Echoing the most recent speaker, the interest of the presidents and chancellors is not to weaken intercollegiate athletics, but rather to strengthen it. We really are here to save or help you save intercollegiate athletics. Our committee in this meeting on Tuesday night, and those other presidents and chancellors who were there, I believe, developed a rather strong consensus in support of No. 100, simply because it has been pointed out by several individuals here today, by Chancellor Young, Mr. Reitz, athletic director at Stanford, and the president of Stanford, the savings that could be affected by No. 100.

I believe, also, that savings are greater here than all the other resolutions that have been introduced in this body the last two or three sessions combined. At Washington State University we recognize the savings at \$65,000. There is a savings factor. That is by all means the greatest factor that has brought presidents and chancellors to this Association's meeting.

Unless the Association begins to take action, favorable action on proposals that will reduce the costs of intercollegiate athletics, you will see the presidents and chancellors here in greater numbers in the future. You will see them here as their own delegates from their own institutions.

Perhaps I should close with that. It sounds like a threat. Maybe it is. But if you think the affairs of the National Collegiate Athletic Association are in a mess now, wait until the presidents and chancellors come in here in large number. [Laughter] I urge your support of No. 100, or some resolution of that sort, because in principle it is sound, and I know it will help save the intercollegiate athletic enterprise of this nation. [Applause]

Glenn Olds (Kent State University): I want to speak in support of the resolution, but from a slightly different angle than has been described. One of the critical problems of our time nationally has to do with the problem of credibility. It is a critical problem on our campus and in our country. It is part of the mood of the concern of our students and our supportive public, our legislators and our donors. This

Convention assembled called a special meeting to address the problem of escalating costs. In the interest to try to preserve the support of intercollegiate athletics, which I have been committed to a whole lifetime, the concern has been that it appears to all of these constituencies these escalated costs have created inequities on our campuses and a critical burden to the institution.

Many of us journeyed to the special meeting and reported back to our campuses the seriousness of this legislation and attention was being followed up by the Convention. This proposal, as Chancellor Young and others have said, is perhaps the largest single confirmation of our seriousness in the intent to regulate costs, to retain quality, and to address these issues.

I am here certainly in response to that concern from our institutions and our constituencies. It is our feeling that we have tried to address ourselves to the charges that have been raised by the opposition to the resolution. As President Shriver said, this proposal combines merit and need. It does not inordinately discriminate against the student-athlete but addresses his critical need dependent on the circumstances of his family and his own capacity to work, and relates that to the support base coming from our student fees which lies behind a lot of our athletic programs.

Additionally, it responds to the public's concern for efforts to reduce costs and to improve that inequity. It is responsive to Title IX. It is responsive to the concerns of our constituencies. I think if we defeat this proposal, the consequence will be to hold that we do not have the integrity with respect to our announced intention to address the problem of economy and that, in fact, this has been a lot of rhetoric without substance. I hope very much the Convention will support the proposal.

President Fuzak: This is such an important point, I don't wish to limit the debate; however, it seems to me we have covered both sides of the issue reasonably well. I am going to ask subsequent speakers to try to limit their remarks.

C. H. Gilstrap (Appalachian State University): I shall be brief. I urge you to heed the admonitions of most of the presidents here, since that seems to be a pretty good policy. I have found that to be advisable in a model career. [Laughter] This is very similar to a proposal advanced by the Committee on Financial Structure, headed by Bill Flynn, either in Hollywood, Florida or Houston. The times kind of run together when you get old. I voted against it. It was overwhelmingly defeated. I wrote Bill a letter of apology later, which he graciously accepted.

I think most of our financial problems have been precipitated by the fact that we cast that vote. I urge your support for Proposal No. 100.

Ed Hammond (Seton Hall University): I should like to try to answer a couple of the questions that have been asked, because I think some of you may be laboring under some misconceptions of the issues that have been raised regarding this.

First of all, regarding the right to work under this particular proposal, like any other financial aid program, this is based on need and merely combines work with income if you look at that section. It doesn't deny the student-athlete the right to work. It simply says

that income from work will be taken into consideration, such as income from any other student who works. There is no denial of the right to work on the part of the student-athlete.

The CSS or the AST are the two major services that are provided nationally for defining needs most of our financial aid offices use. I think the last count was over 83 per cent of the students in the country were using one or the other of the two services. Those are in accordance with this particular proposal.

There is just a slight change, but if you followed your financial aid officer's recommendations, based upon AST or CSS you would be in compliance with this particular resolution and in the guidelines provided by the NCAA.

Lastly, the question raised about whether or not HEW was going to want to interfere with what you are doing, I am sure they wouldn't as long as the actions of the financial aid officer are in keeping with the regulations of meeting the needs. As long as you stay with one of the primary services, AST or CSS, you will have no problems meeting the requirements of HEW in this particular matter.

John Toner (University of Connecticut): My remarks are intended to be factual and informative. I hope they are. In 1966, the University of Connecticut adopted a grant-in-aid policy after having a need policy for its entire athletic program. At that time, we adopted the grant-in-aid policy on the fact that Connecticut measured as the highest per capita income state in the country, but we agreed to keep records each year and ask our athletes to fill out the college scholarship service and the confidential grant need.

We have a record of how it stacks up against the grant-in-aid total amount spent. In short, we have never had less than 51 per cent of measurable need in our program, and we have had as much as 82 per cent of measurable need in our program.

We adopted this formula on the basis that athletics has always been a haven for the needy. It has proven out to be that way.

Delaney Kiphuth (Yale University): Very briefly, I rise to testify to the fact that in an athletic program the need program can work, and I think that can be substantiated by several institutions in Division III. Speaking for the Ivy Group, I can tell you it works. It works well; and it reduces the distinction between the athlete and the rest of the student body, which we all want to achieve.

William Cramer (Delaware Valley College): I probably hold the most unique position in all America. I am the director of admissions and the athletic director combined. [Laughter] I am very much in favor of need grants and awards. However, putting another application in, I would like to point out to the group that today the financial aid, a student, whether an athlete or not, must fill out a parent's confidential statement to receive an economic opportunity grant for a national defense loan.

He must fill out a BEOG, which goes to Iowa, in order to receive a BEOG scholarship. That is two forms. If he happens to be from the state of Pennsylvania, which our school is and wants to receive a state scholarship from the state, he must fill out a third form. With his BEOG and his PCS, he must now fill out a notarized copy of the parent's 1040 form.

If your own school has a financial aid form, which many schools in the East do, the boy or his parents are filling out five forms. Now you want to add another one. The PCS in Princeton and the BEOG, which is done by ACT, this past year are so far apart that it is impossible for a financial aid director to predict what a person is going to get on a BEOG, and that money is not given out until August or September of the year prior to the starting of school.

If you are going to fill out another form and ask a financial aid director to re-evaluate all the forms he already has, I think you are asking for an awfully lot of trouble and you will never get it.

James Frank (Lincoln University, Mo.): This is subjecting you to another college president. As I listened to the presidents, I think I am probably the president of the smallest college that has spoken already. Of course, the tendency is that I echo the sentiments of the other college presidents.

I will not take the time to address myself to many of the issues that have been raised already, except to say that at Lincoln we require all of the athletes to fill out the necessary financial aid forms. I don't believe that it is going to require additional personnel in the financial aid office to take care of the athletes on campus, although we recognize that you have to staff the financial aid office with competent and adequate personnel.

I don't believe it is contrary to the philosophy of granting aid to athletes based upon excellence. As an individual and college president who has come up through college athletics, received a grant-in-aid and has been very close to the collegiate athletic program all my life, I urge you to support this particular proposal. I recognize it might not be perfect; however, this is the time we must begin. We cannot delay it until next year or two years hence.

Lewis McCullough (Iowa State University): I happen to be on the committee that formed this particular piece of legislation, and I just feel I should talk about something that might be a little different because I happened to be at Indiana University in 1957 when we put in the need program.

I remember when Tug Wilson came down and explained it. I thought it was asinine and they would throw it out in three years. They did. I think we should consider the football player and wrestler. I would hate to think that Mark Spitz could not receive a scholarship because his dad might be a dentist, or Dan Gable could not get a scholarship because his dad made a little money as a car salesman. I am certain it will save money.

Since 1952 we have put in room, board, books and tuition and \$15 a month. At that time we only played nine football games, and we asked the football player to come out September 1st. Now, we ask the football player to lose the month of August, because he cannot work. He has to come out for six months. He has to work and really put forth a lot of effort, because football supports most of the other programs. I hate to see a young man be penalized because he worked on a weight program or a swimming program, or any of these others, whether he is a good golfer or not, because his dad might be a dentist. I think we are taking away one of the basic things we have had in America, and that is the right to excel and do something.

I would hate to be penalized because my parents made just a little bit of money. Speaking as a former football coach, I know that the football coaches don't want this; and I know the basketball coaches don't want this. I think it would be hard to implement it. I urge you to vote against No. 100.

Robert Guelker (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville): Our school is not a big time football team. In fact, we don't have football. I am not a president, but I am opposed to this legislation for two reasons. One, I don't believe that it puts the athlete on equal basis with other students. I think it was one part missing to make it equal. That is, the student who gets an academic scholarship can go out and earn any amount of money he wants. The athlete is restricted to the educational equivalency and this is discrimination in that regard.

Secondly, is it to take care of the wealthy? The wealthy can take care of themselves, and I am opposed to the situation where the middle class is being questioned again.

Harry Philpott (Auburn University): I am president of Auburn University and a member of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. I simply feel that we ought not to get the impression there is unanimity among the presidents. I, myself, am going to vote against Proposal No. 100 and vote for the resolution by Michigan.

I feel there are a great many issues that still need to be studied and need investigation. We have not talked about the non-grant-in-aid athlete who comes out, competes, may be needed. We have a man who has been given a grant-in-aid on the basis of need and gets no need. What about the walk on?

We have two years to comply with the guidelines as far as Title IX are concerned. I don't feel we should rush in this. We had a bad experience in trying to put an academic floor into effect in this Association and just eliminated it completely through experience. I would like to see us defeat Proposal No. 100 and vote for Resolution No. 100-2.

Richard J. Nelson (Northern Illinois University): In accordance with section 4 of Executive Regulation 1, I have a request to make, a request which I do not make lightly and only after consultation with a number of the delegates present. My request is that there be a roll call vote on Proposal No. 100. Therefore, Mr. President, I so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Fuzak: I would like to point out that we can do that, but we will have to do it this afternoon. There is no way that it can be done now and complete the vote. It will have to be done after lunch. I, also, point out again that the vote is by divisions.

Stanley McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): All of us came here, I am sure, for basically two principal reasons: basically and more importantly to give support to those measures which are going to preserve and strengthen programs of intercollegiate athletics; and secondly, but related to the first, is to support measures which while strengthening athletics would effect economies in intercollegiate athletic programs.

Of all the measures in our booklet, and there are many important

ones, there is no question but what that is one of the most important. I think it could be said it is the most important. I recognize that all of us are interested in reorganization, and certainly the matter of women's intercollegiate athletics is of great importance, also. But, in the long run, with respect to the future of intercollegiate athletics, I feel a case can be made that this measure of granting athletic grants-in-aid on basis of need could well be established as the most important matter before us. Therefore, it has deserved the lengthy discussion we have had; and it deserves your most careful consideration.

I regard, as a fellow president mentioned a few minutes ago, that while most of the objections to this measure have been presented very sincerely, I know that most of them can be categorized fairly to an extent nit-picking. The thrust of this measure is, in principle, of vital importance and must be adopted. If it is not adopted today, I assure you it is going to be adopted in the not too distant future. Almost every president—it was every president until President Philpott just spoke—spoke in support of this measure.

There has been comment that this is unfair to the student-athletes. As one who was a student-athlete a long, long time ago and who has continued a very active interest and very strong, sympathetic support of student-athletes, I do not believe this discriminates against the student-athletes. It is fair in its provisions. A student who has need and a student-athlete who has need will receive full support. A student-athlete, like other students, who do not have need, will not receive room and board and book provisions, but will receive tuition. Chancellor Young made the point—and I wish to re-emphasize it—on campuses university presidents know it is of the utmost importance that this is the single item which is most criticized by our students and by faculty. The athletes are granted special privileges and, thus, become a group apart and that is difficult, if not impossible, to defend or to rebut. I believe it is entirely fair and possible to defend the granting of tuition, just as we grant tuition for other talent majors for abilities in drama, debate and music.

Finally, I wish to urge you to support measure No. 100. It may not be 100 per cent perfect as it stands, but it is workable. It can be administered, and I believe it is eminently fair and unquestionably of the utmost importance to the future of intercollegiate athletics.

President Fuzak: After checking out the request for a roll call vote, to be certain that we did not have a special rule and in the absence of a special rule Robert's indicates a majority vote of the body must support the roll call vote.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): Let me just say that the Executive Regulations state there are four ways to vote. It enumerates them, voice, paddle, roll call and secret. Now, if there is a paddle vote, there is no vote. That is agreed by the chair. To quote Sturgess and Robert's, they provide that there should be a provision as to how much of a minority should be a vote on this.

I believe when I quote Robert's, the parliamentarian gives me Sturgess. When I quote Sturgess, we get Robert's. [Laughter] In the absence of such special rule, a majority vote is required to order the taking of a vote by roll call. What is stated in the Executive

Regulations merely indicates it may be taken by these methods. I don't think that is a special rule, sir. It doesn't say how many.

President Fuzak: It has been moved by President Nelson and seconded that we have a roll call vote, and the discussion is only related to that.

Richard Bond (Northern Colorado University): In speaking on that particular point, it seems to me that here is a very critical issue as to whether these delegates are willing to go on record individually as to where they stand on this.

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. President, a point of order. I would like a ruling from the parliamentarian. The way I read the Executive Regulation, and I believe this has been tradition, it says shall be first voice, second paddle, third roll call. I take that to mean in that order. I don't think any motion is necessary. I think the direction is there. It shall be in that order.

Alan, get your Manual out. The Executive Regulations which describes how we will vote is Section 4 of Regulation 1 says, "The methods of voting at any NCAA Convention shall be as follows: (1) voice; (2) paddle; (3) roll call, and (4) secret, marked ballot."

There has been an interpretation in previous Conventions and, if I am not mistaken used by my esteemed colleague President Alan Chapman last year, that is the order in which we are taking a vote. I am asking him for a ruling, if that is a correct interpretation of this regulation. I guess what I am saying is, this vote is out of order if he rules this is the order in which we are going to vote. We are going to first call for a voice vote, not on that particular motion in front of you, but on the issue.

President Fuzak: I ruled that it is appropriate to have a motion to have a roll call vote. I think that ought to be a privilege extended and since we already, by announcement and by common consent in acceptance of my announcement we would not have voice votes, we have already bypassed the voice vote. We have agreed to vote by paddle.

Now, a request and motion has been made which I think is proper to vote by roll call.

Richard Lyman (Stanford University): In most organizations that have decided on which rule they are going to operate with, there is a provision whereby a minority, something like 20 per cent of the body, can insist upon a roll call vote. You do not require a majority.

However, I agree with the chair, under the circumstances in which the NCAA operates has made a correct ruling, that we need a motion and a majority apparently. I wish to point out one other thing. I have some mixed feelings about a roll call on this issue.

As President Philpott has indicated, all presidents are not of one accord. Anyone who ever imagined that was not a university president. Now, we have had the request made. We are not operating in private or in secret. Our proceedings are well publicized. It is a very different situation once you have been asked explicitly to stand up and be counted.

There is when you say no, it looks much worse than if you just had gone ahead and voted in the same way. We have been challenged with a roll call vote. It is merely a vote that people vote their

conscience and stand up and be counted, and I think we should do it.

Harold Abel (Central Michigan University): I don't want to challenge your ruling at this moment, but I think I am about to. [Laughter] I believe there is a misunderstanding between your remarks and those intended by the speaker before President Lyman. I would like to interpose here and see if I can add some fire in it.

I think what the intention of the remarks were that the order in which a delegate or the delegates may request; first, a voice call, if someone asks for a division, or a paddle vote, so that the paddles may be counted. Now, that is the next method.

He then is indicating that he believes beyond that if someone asks for a roll call, that roll call may then go. Now, I believe that is the intent. If not, I should be corrected. He has also asked for a ruling by the parliamentarian whether he is correct. I believe he is entitled to that ruling. I would like to see it.

President Fuzak: The parliamentarian says he believes he is not correct.

The question has been called for. The question is on whether we shall have a roll call vote. It requires a majority vote of the entire body.

[The motion for a roll call vote was approved, 253-203.]

President Fuzak: We will have a roll call vote, and we will be prepared to do it following the Honors Luncheon. We will not do it by the names of the delegates, but rather by institutions represented here. We will do that immediately after lunch. We are recessed at this time.

[The Convention recessed at 10 a.m.]

HONORS LUNCHEON

Friday, January 16, 1976

The 11th annual Honors Luncheon was held in the Illinois-Missouri-Meramec Rooms of Stouffer's Riverfront Inn, NCAA President John A. Fuzak presiding.

President Fuzak: It is my distinct privilege to welcome you to the 11th annual National Collegiate Athletic Association Honors Luncheon. If you will please rise, Homer Rice, director of athletics at the University of North Carolina, and a leader in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, will deliver our invocation.

Homer C. Rice (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): May we pray. Father of all mankind, cause us to do away with selfishness and little thinking. Strive with our help to build a fellowship of believers who will truly be a mighty fortress in this day. Be a part of our fellowship here and strengthen us by the taking of this food to enlarge our service to You and Your kingdom. In His name, we pray. Amen.

President Fuzak: Each of us in attendance today is dedicated to the continued advancement of intercollegiate athletics. Each of us is also cognizant of the influence athletics has on student bodies at all institutions of higher education. We are not reminded often enough of the remarkable academic, civic and athletic accomplishments achieved by many student-athletes.

This occasion permits the association to recognize student-athletes who have brought academic and athletic distinction to themselves, and their universities, as well as to former student-athletes who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions and in their communities.

It is my pleasure, before introducing our master of ceremonies, to present to you a man who has been of inestimable value to me during the past year. Your Secretary-Treasurer for 1975 is a man with broad experience in intercollegiate athletics who has applied his time and judgment to the many problems the Officers have faced this year. I am happy to present Stanley J. Marshall, director of athletics and health, physical education and recreation at South Dakota State University. [Applause]

Our master of ceremonies is one of the outstanding professionals in sports broadcasting, a friend of intercollegiate athletics and athletes in many sports, and many individuals in this audience. Keith Jackson, popular announcer for ABC Sports and the voice of college football, has been selected Sportscaster of the Year for three consecutive years by the National Association of Sportscasters and Sports Writers.

A native of Georgia, he began his career at KOMO-TV in Seattle, following his graduation at Washington State University in 1954. He joined the ABC Los Angeles staff 10 years later and has handled a myriad of assignments over the past dozen years.

In addition to his play-by-play responsibilities for college football, Mr. Jackson has covered other sports, from professional golf to ABC Championship Auto Racing, major league baseball, the Professional Bowlers Tour, and numerous other events for ABC's Wide World of Sports. He also has hosted ABC's popular Super Stars, Women Super Stars and The Superteams telecasts.

Mr. Jackson has received many professional honors, including the George Foster Peabody Award, the Headliners Award, and the Sylvania Award. Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to present our friend, Mr. Keith Jackson. [Applause]

Keith Jackson: It is my privilege to be here. I am delighted to be back again. I was with you in 1972, and I have had an opportunity to meet with many of you since that time. I only can say, in a positive sense as we begin our program today, that we of the American Broadcasting Company are delighted to advertise the fact that college football television viewing went up 20 per cent this past year, which translates, according to those brilliant mathematicians, who do such things, as roughly 30 million people every Saturday, at one time or another, watch college football. We think the product is pretty good and so does the American public.

On this matter of awards, as far as I am concerned, I recall one time my great-granddaddy said, "If you can't eat it or sleep with it, don't worry a whole lot about it." [Laughter]

While the Honors Luncheon focuses on the Postgraduate Scholarship Program, the College Athletics' Top Ten and the Theodore Roosevelt Award, we would like to begin today's program, however, with three special awards. Executive Director Walter Byers will present our first two honorees.

Walter Byers (NCAA executive director): Our world of intercollegiate athletics is portrayed to the American public by various communication media, but surely the most lasting is the accounting provided by the sports reporters of the nation's newspapers.

We honor today two of the most distinguished members of that honorable profession. We pay tribute to these reporters not necessarily because they are nationally recognized among their colleagues—but because these men have covered NCAA Conventions for their newspapers for more than 25 consecutive years.

It is my pleasure to introduce to you two longtime friends, Freddie Russell, of the NASHVILLE BANNER, and Tom Siler, of the KNOXVILLE NEWS-SENTINEL, both from the great State of Tennessee; two men who faithfully and conscientiously have recorded our proceedings for more than a quarter of a century. [Applause]

Mr. Jackson: I am sure those two distinguished journalists will make note of the fact that someone showed remarkable foresight in scheduling this NCAA Convention in these trying times right across the street from the Tums factory. [Laughter]

Now, your NCAA President, John A. Fuzak of Michigan State University, has another special presentation.

President Fuzak: On July 31, 1977, a very good friend of college athletics will retire after 20 years of service as executive secretary of the National Federation of State High School Associations. Actually, Cliff Fagan is a very good friend of all amateur athletics.

He has served most of the major sports organizations of this

nation with great distinction. Currently, he is a member of the U.S. Olympic Committee, board of directors and executive committee. Particularly active in basketball, he has served as secretary to the rules-making National Basketball Committee of the United States and Canada for 17 years. Currently, he is president of this nation's new international franchise holder, the Amateur Basketball Association of the United States.

He was president of the Basketball Federation for six years during the successful campaign to become the franchise holder. Most importantly, he always has promoted the closest possible ties and support among the members of the school-college athletic community. The NCAA has had a dedicated friend in the National Federations under his leadership.

Cliff, although you still have lots of time to serve, your many friends in the NCAA wanted to be at the front of what surely will be a long line of persons and organizations planning to honor and salute you. At this time, will you please come to the podium so that I may present you with this special plaque in recognition of your friendship and service. [Applause]

Mr. Jackson: The NCAA Honors Luncheon recognizes three distinct areas of intercollegiate athletics, and it is significant the first part of our agenda focuses upon the outstanding Postgraduate Scholarship Program. There were 80 recipients chosen for awards this year. There has been one important change in the Postgraduate Scholarship Program during the year; the value for each award has increased from \$1,000 to \$1,500.

Robert F. Ray, dean of the Division of Extension and University Services at the University of Iowa, who was President of the NCAA in 1964 when this program was initiated, traditionally has presented a former student-athlete to respond for all past honorees. As many of you know, I am sure, Dr. Ray has had surgery and was not able to be with us.

We do have a gentleman to fulfill this function today that we are all very proud of. This is Jerome Holland, a former Theodore Roosevelt Award winner, and a member of the first Postgraduate Scholarship Program while serving as president of Hampton Institute. He also was president of Delaware State College, a member of the NCAA Council and was appointed Ambassador to Sweden.

Jerome H. Holland: It is an honor and privilege to participate in this meaningful, educational program sponsored by the NCAA. The NCAA is an educational organization and over the years it has attempted to enrich and expand the educational experiences of those young people participating in the intercollegiate athletic program.

Thus, it is with real pride that many of us individually remember the NCAA initiating its Postgraduate Scholarship Program a dozen years ago. As one looks back a few years, athletes in some instances were not receiving recognition for the outstanding academic records they were establishing as student-athletes, and the association voted to designate funds—primarily from the football television income—to finance 32 \$1,000 scholarships each year.

The criteria then, as today, simply required a student-athlete to earn at least a 3.0 or "B" accumulative grade point and perform

with distinction in his sport. This program has grown in stature since its inception. The NCAA currently awards 80 scholarships each year, and their value has been increased to \$1,500.

Since 1964, 817 student-athletes have been honored; and the NCAA has invested \$833,500 in our nation's future through this program. A recent survey by the American College Testing Program indicates student-athletes graduate at a higher rate than other members of the student body, and this program certainly exemplifies the number of students who earn a varsity letter while pursuing academic excellence.

As educators and athletic administrators, it reaffirms our strong belief in the essential value of an athletic program in our institutions' curriculums and the student-athlete concept.

It is my pleasure to introduce one of these distinguished student athletes in the person of Eugene Stanford Takle.

Eugene Stanford Takle's athletic and academic achievements have been equalled by few student-athletes, and his reputation in climatology and meteorology research rapidly is gaining repute with academicians throughout the nation.

During his student-athlete career at Luther College, Mr. Takle graduated magna cum laude, majoring in physics and mathematics and was presented the President's Achievement Award annually recognizing the institution's outstanding graduating senior. He, also, was the recipient of three academic-oriented scholarships, a member of the Freshmen and Senior Honor Society and listed in Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities.

Athletically, Mr. Takle's record was equally impressive. A three time all-America in cross country and track, he finished in the top six in NCAA championship competition seven times. He won the College Division cross country title his senior season, after establishing himself the high point man in the National Collegiate Track Championships as a junior, winning the three-mile and six-mile runs and placing second in the demanding steeplechase.

Mr. Takle established over 25 records and was presented the Sports Illustrated Meritorious Achievement Award in 1975. He was one of 30 students selected on a competitive basis from the United States to attend a six-week summer institute in space physics at Columbia University by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration following his graduation in 1966.

He utilized his NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship while earning a doctorate in physics at Iowa State University, and he currently is an assistant professor in climatology and meteorology. His graduate research projects included a study of electronic properties of metals and the electromagnetic radiation generated by severe thunderstorms and tornadoes.

Mr. Takle's current research features the dynamic and dispersive characteristics of the atmospheric boundary layer—the lowest kilometer of the atmosphere—and evaluating how these characteristics relate to the dispersal of air pollutants. He also is responding to the national call for exploration of alternate energy sources and is exploring the potential for wind, solar and combined wind-solar systems as economically feasible energy sources.

Mr. Takle authored four major papers last year, including two

for the Iowa Academy of Sciences. A summer visiting scientist for the National Center for Atmospheric Research in 1973, he also was selected one of the Outstanding Young Men in America in 1974. Ladies and gentlemen, in this bicentennial year of our nation, where we are evaluating and assessing and programming our future, it is encouraging to note that our future as a nation is encouraging, as it is being guided by such outstanding student-athletes as Eugene Stanford Takle. Therefore, I am honored on your behalf to present Eugene Stanford, who will respond for all NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship recipients. [Applause]

Eugene S. Takle: Thank you, Ambassador Holland, for that very generous introduction. I am honored to have this opportunity to respond for the previous recipients of NCAA Postgraduate Scholarships. We are indebted to you, the NCAA, first of all, for providing an environment during the informative years that stresses self-discipline, dedication and in a competitive spirit.

You have encouraged high standards of achievement, but you have also encouraged humility in the course of victory and self-respect in the course of defeat. Acquisition of these characteristics is unavoidable in rigorous athletic competition. However, these traits, once learned, are not compartmentalized in athletics, but tend to influence the athlete's approach to all areas of human endeavor.

The NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Program has encouraged the directing of these attitudes toward advanced education. We express our gratitude to the NCAA for the financial assistance and for shaping a set of personal standards that leads to achievements in our areas, other than athletics.

As I read of the accomplishments of other past scholarship winners in the fields of business, law, medicine and education, I am convinced the coaching received at NCAA member institutions and the financial assistance and national recognition the NCAA has provided through its scholarship program are preparing young men for roles of national leadership in many fields of endeavor.

In closing, I wish I could amplify my voice over 800 times for I know that all past scholarship winners would want to join me in saying thank you. Thank you to you, the NCAA and coaches who have challenged us to new levels of achievement and have provided the training necessary to attain those goals; to you, the administrators of NCAA member institutions who have seen fit to provide a wide range of competitive athletic programs among our colleges and universities; especially to you, the leaders of the NCAA, for the Postgraduate Scholarship Program, visible and tangible evidence of your concern for athletes and individuals.

To all of you, we express our sincere appreciation. Thank you. [Applause]

Mr. Jackson: Thank you, Eugene. It is incredible in the course of study, but can you tell me if it is going to rain tomorrow? [Laughter]

Another important part of the NCAA's Honors Program is College Athletics' Top Ten. This program gives the Association an opportunity to identify the top five outstanding senior student-athletes of the preceding calendar year, and it recognizes five distinguished former student-athletes on their silver anniversary as college graduates.

Each NCAA member institution is asked to nominate its top senior student-athletes and a former athletic standout for these prestigious honors. The specific selection criteria for the awards, which are a combination of athletics and academic achievement and distinguished service, are listed in your program. Some of them are just absolutely awesome what some of these young men and some of these young, whether their ages are 20 or 40, have done.

The NCAA is honored by the presence of the College Athletics' Top Ten as we salute them for their achievements and contributions. May I present Today's Top Five honorees at this time.

Gentlemen, as your name is called, if you would please rise and remain standing at your place. Following a brief resume of your collegiate career, please come to the podium to receive your award from Secretary-Treasurer Marshall.

Our first is Marvin Lawrence Cobb, from the University of Southern California, baseball and football. His institutional representative is Richard H. Perry, director of athletics. One of the most versatile athletes in Pacific-8 Conference history, Marvin Cobb earned all-America recognition in baseball and football, participating on two national championship teams in each sport.

He hit .333 and .329 his senior and junior seasons, respectively, and scored 110 runs in 112 games. The team captain and all-College-World-Series performer established a school record with 17 stolen bases last year.

Marvin, also, has 10 collegiate career pass interceptions, and earned a starting cornerback position in his first year in professional football with the Cincinnati Bengals.

Much of his time also was devoted to campus activities. He earned a 3.1 g.p.a. majoring in business administration and was inducted into the prestigious Skull and Dagger Men's Honorary. An NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship and National Merit Winner, Marvin also received the Trojan Diamond Medal signifying ability, courage, intelligence and general worth.

Perhaps his most satisfying accomplishment has been realization of the California Museum of Science and Industry on the USC campus. Marvin was the lone student representative on a planning committee to design the museum's Hall of Finance, and he enlisted students for dialogue bridging the generation gaps of people visiting it.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are honored to present an outstanding student, an outstanding athlete, an outstanding young man in all ways, one who very easily could have been the National Football League Rookie of the Year this year, Mr. Marvin Lawrence Cobb, from the University of Southern California. [Applause]

Archie Griffin, Ohio State University, football. His institutional representative and coach is Woody Hayes. Archie Griffin knows all about odds, all about pressures, probably has come to grips with the facets of life as notably as any young man I have ever watched grow. Unfortunately, I have had to do it at a greater distance than I would have liked.

But you may remember when the NCAA adopted its eligibility rule in 1972 permitting freshmen to participate on varsity teams, there were many doubters. Some coaches would admit a limited

number of student-athletes might help a team in a reserve role, but not in a tradition-rich program like Ohio State.

Archie earned a starting position his freshman season, and became a three time all-America. In the second game that very first year, he woke up everybody in the country. As a junior, he won the Heisman Trophy and then the whole country was wondering whether or not it could be possible for a man to win it twice; and he did it twice.

There was also acclaim for this man, because he is a man. When the ballots were cast, I am sure it was the qualities of the human being that had so much to do with how the vote went. Archie became the most prolific runner in NCAA history, gaining a record 5,177 yards and also set another national standard with 31 consecutive 100-yard-plus rushing performances.

An industrial relations major who is graduating one academic quarter early, the two-year captain also has been an active fund raiser for the Columbus Community Track Club and Police Athletic League. He participates in the Columbus Intercity Better Chance, encouraging ghetto children to pursue an education, and is an active speaker and member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes.

Archie has served as honorary chairman for many charitable projects, including the Special Olympics and Big Brothers. He speaks in grade school and junior high school assemblies almost daily, after the football season is completed, and has spent considerable time counseling inmates at the Columbus Workhouse.

He chose to come here today to this luncheon, instead of going to Japan on an exhibition tour. Ladies and gentlemen, we are honored to present Archie Griffin, Ohio State University. [Applause]

Bruce Alan Hamming, Augustana College (Ill.), basketball. His institutional representative is Vincent Lundeen, director of athletics. Few student-athletes have equalled Bruce Hamming's athletic accomplishments and his academic accomplishments. He had an outstanding athletic career leading his team in scoring and rebounding and a berth in the National Collegiate Division III Basketball Championship where he earned all-tournament recognition.

The Augustana College scoring and rebounding record holder and captain also participated as a member of the American National Team in the Cup of Nations Tournament in Bogota, Colombia. Bruce's athletic achievements were exceeded only by his academic success. He established a perfect 4.0 g.p.a. studying pre-medicine and bypassed opportunities in professional basketball to enroll at the University of Illinois School of Medicine.

However, the Phi Beta Kappa did more than play basketball and study medicine. He also held several vital leadership positions on his campus. Bruce was a member of Phi Omega Phi and a summa cum laude graduate. He also was president of the Akros Freshmen Male Honorary and the recipient of the Order of Lincoln Educational Achievement Award.

He may very well be the real bionic man. Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present Bruce Alan Hamming of Augustana College. [Applause]

Patrick Timothy Moore, Ohio State University, diving. His institutional representative is J. Edward Weaver, director of athletics. Tim Moore is a familiar name in intercollegiate and international

competition, and the world class diver is America's top candidate for gold medals at the Montreal Olympics this summer.

A five-time NCAA champion, he won the one- and three-meter titles his sophomore and senior seasons, captured the one-meter trophy and placed third in three-meter competition as a junior, and finished third in each event his freshman year.

Tim also has won seven of eight Big Ten titles during his career at Ohio State and has captured 18 major championships, including the recent Pan American Games three-meter. He also was second there in the 10-meter platform competition.

A Phi Beta Kappa and NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship recipient, the pre-med student earned a 3.90 g.p.a. majoring in microbiology. He received the Big Ten Honor Medal for proficiency in scholarship and athletics and was selected for Bucket and Dipper Men's Honorary. In addition to his athletic and academic pursuits, Tim was an active member in Sigma Chi fraternity and also spent considerable time initiating a diving program for Columbus-area children.

He currently is continuing his education at Ohio State University with the assistance of the Corwin A. Fergus Memorial Award, annually presented to the outstanding student-athlete pursuing an advanced curriculum. He will enter the Ohio State Medical School after the Olympics this fall. Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present Patrick Timothy Moore, Ohio State University. [Applause]

You see, size doesn't mean a thing. [Laughter] This is a tough competitor. I have watched him all over the world.

From the West, Mr. John Michael Sciarra, UCLA, football. His institutional representative is Chancellor Charles E. Young. John Sciarra was considered one of the nation's top returning quarterbacks prior to the 1975 football season. He received pre-season publicity as a Heisman Trophy and all-America candidate. All of us who knew John Sciarra knew the kind of fellow he was, and those who have played football with him and against him know what kind of a fellow he is. But there is so much to him. He did not win the Heisman, as you know, although he did receive the wide support of the West.

How fortunate we are to have such quality young men sitting together here on the dais. No other Division I quarterback in the country rushed or passed for more yards than John. He averaged over five yards per rushing attempt and 18.1 yards per passing completions.

As you recall, Pepper Rodgers had him returning punts as a freshman quarterback. He may have been the only quarterback that did that and survived. John finished his career, which began as a punt and kickoff return specialist, with 4,271 yards total offense, and he averaged over 173 yards running and passing per game his junior and senior seasons.

With a tremendous outlook on life, and in recruiting this past year, he was part of the NCAA tour that crossed the country. John Sciarra took only two trips. He knew where he wanted to go and what he wanted to do. His versatility is obvious off the football field. He is a leader in student government, serving on various committees from housing and parking to school spirit, and serves on the Faculty Senate Innovative Studies Program Committee.

John has worked in the National Youth Sports Program the past three summers, and participates in the Athletes for a Better American Program, conducting clinics in the Los Angeles ghetto areas for young children. An NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship and National Football Foundation Hall of Fame Honoree, John has established a 3.3 g.p.a. majoring in Sociology.

He, too, chose to come here instead of going to Japan. Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present John Michael Sciarra from the University of California at Los Angeles. [Applause]

At this time, we would like to present to you the Silver Anniversary Top Five, recognizing outstanding former student-athletes on their 25th year of graduation. There are some of them that still think they can take on the 20-year-olds. [Laughter]

Gentlemen, if you would please rise and remain standing at your place when I call your name. Following a brief resume of your collegiate and postcollege careers, please come to the podium to receive your award.

Napoleon A. Bell, attorney at law, Mount Union College, football and track. His institutional representative is Jackson Rafeld, director of athletics. Napoleon Bell probably never has regretted he ignored an opportunity to sign a professional football contract following graduation to enter law school.

Had he delayed his academic and long-range career pursuits, he possibly would not be a full partner in one of Columbus, Ohio's most prestigious law firms—Bowen, Bell, Francis, White & Saunders. An outstanding athlete at Mount Union College, the two time all-Ohio Conference and all-Ohio halfback and two year team co-captain remains the college's second leading career rusher with a 6.7 average.

Mr. Bell also put the shot and ran on the one-mile relay in track and participated in soccer. His academic and campus activities complemented his football successes. Mr. Bell was historian and president of the Signet Club, president of the Student Christian Association, and a member of the student senate.

He also was selected in Who's Who on Campus, to Blue Key Honorary and as the recipient of the Good Citizenship, Hart Ex-temporaneous Speaking and Reverend Joseph Horner Memorial Awards.

He began his career as an attorney examiner for the Industrial Commission of Ohio and was named special counsel to the Ohio Attorney General four years later. Mr. Bell began his private practice in 1959, and continued professional advancement until his name appeared on the letterhead of Bowen, Bell, Francis, White & Saunders.

A noted Workmen's Compensation lecturer for the Ohio Legal Council, he served on the state's Constitution Revision Committee. Mr. Bell also is founder and chairman of the Beneficial Acceptance Corporation, which assists low income families with home financing. He is a member of the Columbus, Ohio, Chamber of Commerce, currently serving on the School Issues Committee, and Central Ohio Boy Scouts of America Board of Directors; and he is state chairman of the Ohio United Negro College Fund.

He was elected to Who's Who in Ohio in 1974 and is a former

Kappa Alpha Psi Man of the Year. Mr. Bell is a Mount Union College Trustee and has received the institution's distinguished Alumnus Chair. Mr. Bell is a past chairman of the Ohio Board of Tax Appeals and past president of the Columbus Urban League.

He also has served on the Columbus Traffic and Transportation, Urban Renewal and City Development Commissions. Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present Napoleon A. Bell, Mount Union College. [Applause]

Ernest Jackson "Bucky" Curtis, corporate marketing manager, International Paper Company, Vanderbilt University, basketball and football. His institutional representative is Vice-Chancellor R. R. Purdy.

Few individuals associated with Vanderbilt College, the Southeastern Conference or International Paper Company, are familiar with Ernest Jackson Curtis; but mention "Bucky" Curtis and everybody knows who you are talking about. He was all-America and all-Southeastern Conference, catching 27 passes for 791 yards and nine touchdowns, setting a league record for pass receiving yards and ranking third nationally in 1950.

A four-year letterman who also earned two varsity basketball awards, Mr. Curtis was captain of his team and Most Valuable Player in the Senior Bowl, and captain and second in the outstanding player balloting in the East-West Shrine Game. He also played in the College All-Star Game.

Mr. Curtis also was active in campus affairs. The Omicron Delta Kappa Honoree was sophomore class president, vice-president of the junior class and Sigma Alpha Epsilon and sports editor of the VANDERBILT HUSTLER. He began his career as a salesman and rapidly began climbing the corporate ladder.

Mr. Curtis was central region sales manager in Cincinnati nine years before assuming general manager responsibilities placing him in charge of production and sales. Recently, he was named corporate marketing manager for International Paper Company headquarters in Chicago, where he directs efforts to strengthen sales with major customers.

While in the Cincinnati area, Mr. Curtis earned a reputation for his participation in community affairs. He was chairman of the Cincinnati Area United Appeal and the Zone Paper Board Packaging Council, president of the Dan Beard Boy Scouts' Council Area and the Cincinnati Vanderbilt Club, and a member of the Cincinnati Church of the Ascension Vestry.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present Ernest Jackson "Bucky" Curtis, Vanderbilt University. [Applause]

H. Samuel Greenawalt, executive vice-president, Michigan National Bank, University of Pennsylvania, football and squash. His institutional representative is Andy Geiger, director of athletics. Samuel Greenawalt is one of the nation's most respected banking and financial experts.

In fact, the executive vice-president of the Michigan National Bank was featured in a 1975 CBS Documentary, spotlighting America's outstanding business leaders. A football and squash letterman at the University of Pennsylvania, he earned all-America and all-Ivy mention at center, and participated in the Blue-Gray Game.

Mr. Greenawalt was Sigma Chi fraternity pledge trainer, served on the intra-fraternity council and was a member of the Christian Association. In addition to his administrative duties with the Michigan National Bank in Bloomfield Hills, he is senior vice-president of the Michigan National Bank West Metro and serves on the board of directors for these two banks, the Michigan National Bank of Detroit, American Consumer Products, Inc., NARAD, Inc., Palmer Concrete Products and Great Scott Supermarkets, Inc.

CBS could easily spotlight Mr. Greenawalt as the ideal citizen in the business community of the Detroit area. A University of Pennsylvania and Detroit County Day School Trustee, he is a member of the Southeast General Hospital board of directors and the Total Action Against Poverty Committee, Rotary International, and is a visiting professor at Olivet College.

He is a past treasurer of the Southeastern Michigan Cancer Society and past chairman of the Grand Rapids Cancer Society, Heartline, Inc., and United Fund, and a former civil service examiner. A former Little League coach, Mr. Greenawalt has been the National Midwestern Amateur Senior Ski runnerup the past two years, and he is a member of the Michigan Squash Rackets Association.

He also is a former Michigan High School football official and Grand Rapids Kent Country Club Golf champion. Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present H. Samuel Greenawalt, University of Pennsylvania. [Applause]

I don't know how you keep that handicap down so low. [Laughter]

Ladies and gentlemen, Ross J. Pritchard, president of Arkansas State University, University of Arkansas, football and track. His institutional representative is Frank Broyles, director of athletics. Dr. Pritchard's humanitarian reputation began at the University of Arkansas, and it has continued to grow through a storied career in the Peace Corps and the presidency of two institutions of higher learning.

Establishing himself as one of the greatest athletes in Razorback history, the Blue Key Honoree spent most of his *free* time assisting Bob Riley, who later became lieutenant governor of Arkansas. Riley had been severely wounded and almost blinded in World War II before enrolling at Arkansas.

Dr. Pritchard knew the problems facing Riley, and he elected to take identical courses with him for four years, reading the assignments aloud to Riley each night. Dr. Pritchard's athletic success earned him a place on the Arkansas all-decade team of the 1940's, and the versatile back led the Razorbacks to a Southwest Conference championship and invitations to the Dixie and Cotton Bowls.

A four-year starter in football and letterman in track, he is one of only two Razorbacks ever to earn letters four years in two sports. Dr. Pritchard led Arkansas in pass receiving his sophomore and junior seasons and finished his career with 35 receptions for a 17.7 average—still second on the university's record book—and nine touchdowns.

Dr. Pritchard had best times of 9.5 and 20.9 in the 100- and 200-yard dashes, respectively, ran on the 440-yard and one-mile relay teams and was a long jumper. His professional career has been varied, ranging from professorships and assistant football coaching

stints at Tufts College and Southwestern University to the vice-presidency of the Development and Resources Corporation of New York.

He was the corporation's resident manager in Iran six years, administering a multi-purpose development program in Khuzestan and was company liaison with the Iran Government. He also was a member of the Tehran Community School Board of Trustees. Dr. Pritchard was a regional director for the Peace Corps in East Asia and the Pacific, and director of that agency's Office of Public Affairs three years.

He was its director in Turkey two years and deputy secretary general to the International Peace Corps Secretariat. He served on President John F. Kennedy's Executive Committee on Foreign Aid and was co-chairman of the President's Regional Export Expansion Committee, a responsibility he also had shouldered in the Eisenhower administration.

Dr. Pritchard was selected a William L. Clayton Fellow in International Economics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, which is co-administered by Harvard and Tufts. He was president of Hood College three years, where the total enrollment increased 43 per cent during his tenure, and became president of Arkansas State University in 1975.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present Ross J. Pritchard, University of Arkansas. [Applause]

Rodger Wade Stinson, president, United Missouri Bank of St. Louis, University of Kansas, football. His institutional representative is Clyde L. Walker, director of athletics. Wade Stinson rapidly is earning recognition in bank administration. He was named president of the United Missouri Bank of St. Louis only two years ago, but already it has enjoyed outstanding progress under his leadership. But success always has been a Stinson trait. He entered the University of Kansas without an athletic scholarship, but was selected the Jayhawk's most valuable player his senior season.

Mr. Stinson earned all-Big Seven honors his senior season and ranked fifth nationally in rushing, with a school record of 1,129 yards. He also established a Kansas single-game record with 239 yards against Utah and participated in the North-South Game.

He was a member of Delta Upsilon fraternity and Alpha Kappa Psi Business Honorary. Following his graduation, Mr. Stinson entered the insurance business and became a district manager for the Equitable Life Assurance Society in the United States. His alma mater began a search for an athletic director in 1964, and his was the first name considered.

Mr. Stinson served the Jayhawks eight years, and typically became one of the most respected athletic administrators in the nation. Kansas developed a nationally acclaimed overall sports program under his leadership, and Mr. Stinson's peers elected him to the prestigious NCAA Council.

Mr. Stinson joined the United Missouri Bank in 1972 and began advancing faster than he could learn his office telephone number. He quickly was named vice-president of the United Missouri Bank of Kansas City, and in rapid succession selected president of the

United Missouri Bank of Jefferson County and the United Missouri Bank of St. Louis, respectively.

The latter bank had experienced organizational and management problems prior to Mr. Stinson's promotion, and he was directed to its heights, applauded by his peers throughout the nation and to leadership position in civic affairs.

He is an active member of the Methodist Church, has devoted many honors to the St. Louis United Way, and also is a member of Rotary International. Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present Rodger Wade Stinson, University of Kansas. [Applause]

Now, we might ask Mr. Tim Moore to respond on behalf of the Today's Top Five Honorees.

Patrick Timothy Moore (Ohio State University): I think I need to begin by congratulating John Sciarra of UCLA on his team's fine play at the Rose Bowl. As you can see, Ohio State is very well represented here; and we at Ohio State are merely interested in edification of the mind and play sports merely as a hobby. [Laughter] I do think it is nice to have a school represented here that specializes in athletics. Don't you, John? [Laughter]

As the spokesman for the 1975 student-athletes, I should like to thank you for bringing us here and honoring us at your Convention. We need to thank you for many things, not only for us, but for the thousands of college athletes in the past. Your financial assistance and moral support are greatly appreciated by all past and present college athletes.

To place a premium on education and offer us such great athletic programs, seems all paradoxical coming from the NCAA. This award today means only that we five have, in someone's eyes, best taken advantage of an opportunity to excel in those directions, an opportunity you have offered us.

Athletic excellence is most certainly a worthy goal to strive for, but our sharpened minds will long outlive our physical abilities in the years to come. I applaud you for the wisdom and perspective to balance the two realistically. To succeed in these two directions as a student and as an athlete has not always been an easy task.

I often went very embarrassed to a professor to ask if I could take a test early or late—preferably late [laughter]—because of away competition. Sometimes, to be more convincing and impressive, I would then produce a very official looking document from the office of Ed Weaver. Now, he knows why he is so unpopular with the faculty at Ohio State. [Laughter]

On the other hand, I can recall coming late to practice, half-asleep, or not at all, because I had been studying all night for an exam. For all the inconvenience we have caused our teachers, we owe a debt of gratitude for their patience with our athletic schedule and to our coaches for their encouragement and understanding of our academic curricula.

Although there have been road blocks on the way to success in these two directions, I am sure that none of us could or would have it any other way. The attitude which brings us success in our athletic endeavors is the same one which motivates us to be good students. The two activities produce complementary and reinforcing traits.

I know that I approach my academic work with the same energy and discipline as I do my diving. The concentration I have developed in competing athletically in return has helped me apply myself better in the books. I am sure Bruce, John, Marvin and Archie can probably make similar correlations with their sports; and I am sure they also find difficulty in discerning their academic personalities from their athletic personalities.

At the end of that sometimes difficult road to success in two fields is a great education of not only past patterns and protozoa, but people know how to deal with them. This third kind of education may even be the most valuable to us and to all collegiate athletes, whether they are great students, great athletes, or both.

My education in athletics and academics has immeasurably helped me in relation with my fellow man. There must be something good in collegiate athletics, for in looking over the resumé of my cohorts, I can see an overriding orientation now and in the future toward community service.

The Silver Anniversary Five are even more exemplary of this orientation. "Let me become what I become," a theme that is worthwhile. Curt Vonneka expressed my feelings best about the freedom, encouragement and financial support of my education and athletic goals, that the NCAA in my institution, Ohio State, have provided for me.

In the immediate future, some of us will continue in the academic direction, others will pursue an athletic career and all of us will appreciate our educations and our academic and athletic days. [Applause]

Mr. Jackson: Just make sure you do as good off the 10-meter platform. [Laughter] I would say this, that there are no lucky ones sitting there, because luck is a byproduct of preparation, getting acquainted with opportunity. All of those work hard. But you don't get along, I guess, in anything unless you do spell it w-o-r-k.

On this side of the dais, are the men who have practiced it. Responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary Top Five, is Dr. Ross Pritchard.

Ross J. Pritchard (University of Arkansas): I come to the podium a little perplexed. First of all, I have committed the indiscretion of not asking the four other Silver Anniversary honorees what I should say, and this surely is some kind of an impropriety.

On the other hand, all of them are accomplished, articulate and forceful men, who would have had plenty to suggest and to say, and I saw that complicating my task, so I sensed I have committed a lesser indiscretion by just going alone. [Laughter]

My second problem is that I am aware that this ritual of acceptance is very much like a lot of commencements, that it follows the standard litany where all the appropriate observations of platitudes have been made many times, probably much better than I can make them.

Of course, I am expected to say that athletic competition is nobling, that it disciplines the mind and the body and that it strengthens the soul. I know that it ought to be said that a balanced sense of achievement and humility flows from every victory, and that a properly appreciated defeat carries a man closer to the core of his character and inner strength.

He thus moves on a better person, if he has experienced the defeat gracefully. For some this is true, and to some extent I do believe in these things. For some, the benefits of athletic competition are there, and many are intelligent enough to absorb, analyze and assimilate useful lessons. For others, athletic competitions are breached distorted experiences, an interlude between the obscurity of where they have come from and the sad and special oblivion that is set aside for forgotten athletes.

Yet, I feel that I ought to make some concession to tradition and with that in mind, I want to express on behalf of Nap, "Bucky," Sam and Wade a sense of gratitude to Mount Union College, Vanderbilt, Penn, Kansas and in my own case, to the University of Arkansas, that they would remember us and nominate us for this tribute.

I also share with you a small presidential cynicism, that many of these nominations, in the first instance, originate in the hopeful mind of some director of development and deferred giving. [Laughter] Beyond expressing this thanks, I want to make one other observation.

This Silver Anniversary Award means a whole lot to me, because NCAA means so much to college athletics. As player, coach, spectator and now college president, the NCAA has been an important and informative part of my life for 30 years. For 17 years, the NCAA has provided encouragement and support, advice and counsel, stability and integrity to college athletics.

To most of us who were intercollegiate competitors that NCAA medallion has been a badge of honor, and for many of us an NCAA championship has been one of our most prized goals and objectives. I view the NCAA with the admiration and with the expectation it will continue to meet the challenges of a difficult and changing athletic environment.

There is no question that as we meet today that the intercollegiate athletics competitions have come upon tough times. Economic pressures, which are generated beyond our campuses, are inescapable. Many of our additional aggregations also have generated internally on campus, as a result of rambunctious urges to keep up with the competition.

The escalating belief, if we can match bigger athletes, staffs, equalize more intensive programs of recruiting, provide a more extravagant set of facilities, the belief that these that play in blue shirts will fill our stadiums or arenas and our pocket books. In all of this is a peculiar regeneration of expected difficulties not unlike the drunk who increases his drinking to forget he is a drunk.

It would not be appropriate for me to speak to any specific issue illustrating this point. I sit at this table in one capacity, but I really have come to the conference as a fully participating delegate with an Arkansas State University ax to grind.

But in a larger spirit, I feel that it is appropriate to make a plea for balance, to make a suggestion that we review and focus more carefully upon what is essential, and that we redesign the policy and decision making process of this organization.

In terms of balance, I would hope that we recognize that we represent hundreds of institutions of great diversity and our deci-

sions must not cease at the jugular of any particular group. Important issues will develop, debate can and should be spirited; but it should not be lost upon us, that we are all interested in the future of college athletics.

It seems to me that there has been too much good guy versus bad guy confrontation here and that is the casual or not-so-casual threats to depart NCAA, should we not be fully satisfied. This is not a part of what this organization is all about as it shares its common purpose.

In terms of a more meaningful focus on issues, it seems to me that we need careful attention paid to what constitutes policy and principle guidelines, and contrasted with all the legislative minutia which seems to be so much a part of the agenda. At a time when economy is so important, it did not seem to me very economical the other night to engage the time and attention of more than 500 professionals to debate whether we should award letter sweaters.

Somewhere in our concern for economy, we have drifted into a tangle of legislative trivia. As a college president already known by too many reports and ambiguous guidelines, I would hate to see the NCAA become the HEW of college athletics. [Applause]

Finally, in terms of participation, I feel strongly that the membership of the purported Council and committees of the NCAA should be broadened to significantly include more presidents. I suggest this for two reasons. The presidents of this country need to be informed and educated; and at the same time, they can bring a total, institutional perspective to many of the problems here.

A core of participating presidents in the fundamental issues of this organization could easily organize the linkage and liaison to educate presidents clear across the country and bring to bear useful points of new and effective judgments.

Given the scope and dimensions of problems arising in athletics today, they cannot be divorced from the total institution. They cannot be managed fully by coaches or athletic directors. I hope we are able to move in the direction of more balanced, more focus on more important issues and greater participation among the presidents.

Now, it is time to say what I should have said at the outset. To you five honorees who have captured the attention and the admiration of our nation over the past several years, I wish for you the fullest opportunity to expand and realize your full potential. I wish for you fulfillment; and along the way I hope you experience some good fellowship and, most of all, have some fun. I wish the very same for my Silver Anniversary associates in the next 25 years.

My wish for the NCAA is that we find, collectively, the courage and commitment to deal with our new problems with the same sense of integrity that the NCAA has displayed for more than half a century. Knowing what this organization has meant to college athletics, all five of us in our Silver Anniversary, are honored that you would recognize us and pay us your tribute. Thank you very much. [Applause]

Mr. Jackson: Now, ladies and gentlemen, the President of the NCAA, Dr. John A. Fuzak of Michigan State University, to present the Association's highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt Award.

President Fuzak: Thank you, Keith. It is now my privilege to present the Association's highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt

Award. Today the NCAA and collegiate athletics recognize "one of our own," Admiral Tom Hamilton.

To illustrate how special the Teddy Award is, one need only list the past recipients—Gerald R. Ford, Dwight Eisenhower, Omar Bradley, Jesse Owens, Justice "Whizzer" White, Brud Holland and others—all are great Americans.

Today's recipient belongs on any such list. Tom Hamilton is a patriot, leader, outstanding athlete and innovator; but, above all, he shares a trait with many here today. He loves to offer young people a mental and physical challenge and then help them meet it and rise above it.

He is a teacher through inspiration and example. Tom Hamilton has often been honored, and deservedly so; yet he remains unmindful of this acclaim and prestige, as though surprised that others would salute him for getting the job done. We honor him today because he has done so many jobs so well.

Above all, he remains a great friend of many of us in this room. Tom Hamilton was reared in Columbus, Ohio. At the Naval Academy, he earned nine letters. He was an all-America halfback in football and captained the basketball and baseball teams.

In 1926, he kicked three extra points in the famous 21-21 tie with Army in the dedication game at Soldier's Field to give Navy the national championship. Upon graduation in 1927, he was honored as the midshipman who had contributed most to the Academy athletic program and he was elected permanent president of his class, a high honor.

Next, he served at sea, and then became a pioneer naval aviator, prior to coaching football at Navy in 1934, '35 and '36. His top record was 8-1 in 1934. By that time, war was approaching and Tom Hamilton felt that the best way to prepare pilots for aerial combat was to give them vigorous pre-flight trainings in physical fitness and in contact sports.

His concept became the famous V-5 Program, which was enormously successful in terms of combat victory and pilot survival. It may well have been responsible for winning the Pacific War, which hung in precarious balance until the Navy won control of the seas.

With the V-5 well organized, Tom Hamilton was assigned to one of history's great ships, the carrier USS Enterprise. He rose from air officer to executive officer and finally to commanding officer. He took part in most major naval actions in the Pacific from 1943 to 1946, and received two Legion of Merits and the Bronze Star citation.

Home from combat, he was head coach at Navy in 1946 and 1947, and served as the Academy's director of athletics until he left the service to become director of the University of Pittsburgh in 1948. He left Pitt in 1959 to become executive director of the newly-formed Pacific-8 Conference. He retired in 1971.

During this phase of his career, he was instrumental in the formulation of the NCAA Television Plan and was chairman of the first Television Committee. He was a member of the NCAA Executive Committee and the Football Rules Committee, and for 18 years served on the board of directors of the U.S. Olympic Committee.

He was president of the Collegiate Commissioner's Association,

and also served on the executive board of the President's Committee on Physical Fitness under Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. He has been active in the National Football Foundation, and in 1970 was the recipient of that organization's Gold Medal.

He also was inducted into the Hall of Fame as a player in 1965. The Hamiltons have two sons, Tom Jr. and Bill. Tom and his wife Emmie now live in LaJolla, California. It is a delight to me and an honor to all of us that Tom's lovely and charming wife and their son, Tom, are here with us. Will you please rise and receive our acclaim. [Applause]

Ladies and gentlemen, there has been no stronger advocate of college football, of sports of all types and of physical fitness than Tom Hamilton. Therefore, it is fitting that I now present to Admiral Hamilton the highest honor of an association dedicated to those same principles, the 1976 Theodore Roosevelt Award. [Applause]

Rear Admiral Thomas J. Hamilton: This is probably one of the most meaningful moments of my life, and I am filled with emotion and pride. Needless to say, I thank you with all humility and gratitude.

Perhaps it means so much more to me because it comes from you, my associates, my colleagues and my working partners, and I think in reality you were honoring us by choosing me to be your token spokesman. Certainly, I could not accept without acknowledging the joy and the satisfaction of working on NCAA activities through committees, the Council, the Executive Committee, and all the organizations that are within and where we have worked together in competition, some fights, some disagreements of opinion, but certainly with a wonderful group of people.

I am glad you introduced my lovely wife and son. Certainly Emmie has been a great part of all my activities. I am now working for my son. He has a telecommunications company. At the Naval Academy, we used to have a formula call EE equals IR in electricity. They have gone so much farther than that, and I am supposed to understand these things now and assist my son.

But it is fun to work with him. I have another son, Bill, in media advertising in Columbus. I must recognize how fortunate I have been to have attended the Naval Academy and having had the opportunity of coaching there, being athletic director there. I had the same experience at the University of Pittsburgh, then at the Pacific-8 Conference; and I must acknowledge the wonderful cooperation and work of the staff I was privileged to be with at those institutions, and certainly with the other commissioners.

I found out that the eight institutions of the conference mean just as much to you as your own alma mater. When you are working closely with such great people, you become so attached that your work goes together, and I certainly want to acknowledge my associations with these groups in getting this honor.

Certainly, I was thrilled, as all of you were, with the presentations of these wonderful young men and older men who received awards today. I am happy to be included with you in this great, great legend.

The NCAA means a lot to me, and I hope you will bear with me. My first experience really wedded me to it, because right after

Pearl Harbor, I was sent out by the Navy to the NCAA Convention in Detroit to ask for volunteers and for support of the Naval Aviation Training Program.

I think there is a bit of nostalgia when you think of men like Dr. Badger, the President at that time, L. W. St. John, Major Griffith and the other leaders at that time, are typical of the leadership we have had ever since. But they arranged for a joint meeting of the football coaches in the NCAA Conventions when it had not been on the agenda, which today I think would be some problem. [Laughter] But they did it. I was allowed to make my pitch, and I would like to illustrate the characteristics of some of the NCAA personalities by what happened from that time on. Certainly, we were deluged with applicants to come and take part in this program. I flew back from Detroit to Anacostia the same afternoon, and when I reported for work the next morning, who should be there but Bear Bryant. He said, "I won't go home, I heard your speech, I want to go to war." Well, there was no program, there was nothing.

I finally convinced Bear Bryant to go back to Vanderbilt and told him when this thing is organized, he would be the first one that would be called. A week went by; and in the meantime, I had been transferred over to run this pre-flight program, Bear Bryant shows up again.

He says, "I won't go home this time. I am here to stay." So, he lived in our home for a couple of weeks while we put him to work and finally got a civilian contract so he could be paid. So, there, you see the intensity of one of our great leaders.

Another one I would like to point out is Woody Hayes. He was the chief boatswain and obviously had all the qualifications to be the commission officer. [Laughter] So, it happened. All we had to do was point these things out, and he was given his commission.

But he didn't stay with us. He put in for sea duty immediately and off he went on a destroyer escort. I think one of the greatest tributes to a man is the fact that at the end of the War, Woody Hayes was skipper of a destroyer escort. Now, that is some job.

We had the support of the NCAA. Their schedules were opened up so our service teams could play all of them and enjoy the activities of intercollegiate athletics. I think that one of the most telling documentaries to the values of competitive and intercollegiate sports is the fact that we used 11 sports in the training of these fighting pilots, in order that the characteristics that come from sports activity and instruction can go into the qualities of fighter pilots where all elements of physical-mental skills have to come out to be successful. That happened. They certainly turned out the greatest pilots that have ever been in this world.

I hope that the NCAA continues in this role of providing this competitive athletics in the training of youth for all our natural life. It is most important. It should never be lost sight of in the emphasis toward more academic and specialized training.

I have enjoyed and gotten great satisfaction out of all my relationships. I think this is the greatest strength of athletics, the player-to-player relationship, the player-to-coach relationships, the athletic directors, the faculty men, the presidents, the trainers and doctors.

I learned that the officials are a great part of our activity. This is

an unsung group who did a great job, and they are a part of the family and deserve all the glory that comes to the other people. Certainly, I would like to salute the commissioners. I was a part of that organization, and these are men who do a fine job.

Sports writers, broadcasters, they are a part of this family and have done so much for us. I would add the volunteer bowl groups who have provided the climax games to our football seasons for 75 years. These are volunteers, and they work to help us.

So, I am overcome with emotion at this time. I must say that the leadership of the NCAA, throughout the years, has been outstanding. You have had a succession of great Presidents, great Secretary-Treasurers and committee members. I think we have had fine leadership from Major Griffith, Tug Wilson, and from our present director, Walter Byers.

I salute you all. I hope that you stay steadfast in your following of idealism in this tough era of our sports life, and I wish you most success for your continued successful operation. Thank you very much. [The assembly extended a prolonged rising ovation]

President Fuzak: Thank you, Admiral Hamilton. To accept the institutional Theodore Roosevelt Award is Captain J. O. Coppedge, director of athletics at the United States Naval Academy.

Captain J. O. Coppedge: It is indeed a high privilege to participate in these proceedings as a representative of the United States Naval Academy. Admiral Hamilton, on behalf of the whole United States Navy, I accept this plaque in your behalf and it will always occupy an honored place at the Naval Academy.

We, of the Naval Academy and the whole Navy, consider it highly appropriate that Admiral Tom Hamilton be the recipient of the Teddy Roosevelt Award. He certainly personifies the criteria for it. To review briefly the purpose of the award, it is presented to a prominent American who played in athletics and who by his continuing interest and concern for physical fitness by example of his own life has exemplified most clearly and forcefully the ideas and purposes for which college athletic programs and competition are dedicated.

Admiral Hamilton was a great athlete, leader and student at the Naval Academy. He later was a successful and inspiring, effective coach and athletic director. During World War II, he recruited, assembled and motivated the greatest collection of coaches and physical educators ever assembled to conduct the vital pre-flight program for naval aviation. His total contribution to the war effort can never be accurately measured, but it was certainly, indeed, most significant.

His contribution to the University of Pittsburgh and to the Pac-8 Conference, as well as to the National Collegiate Athletic Association, is well documented. The mission of the Naval Academy is to prepare young men morally, mentally and physically to be professional auspices in the Navy service. These ideals have long been recognized to be of sufficient importance to be included in the admission.

The most recent enforcement of the benefits of the Naval Academy's program was provided by Rear Admiral James Stockdale, a prisoner of war in Vietnam for seven and one-half years. Admiral Stockdale credited his ability to enduring and surviving these years

BUSINESS SESSION

Friday Afternoon, January 16, 1976

The session convened at 3 p.m., President John A. Fuzak, presiding.

13. OPENING REMARKS

President Fuzak: Please come to order. President Horn, do you wish to be recognized?

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I have a parliamentary inquiry. The inquiry is this, given the fact that we have spent several hours in recess, would it be appropriate for this Convention to extend its hour today until 6:30 and begin tomorrow at 8 a.m. and go until 1 p.m., break one hour for lunch, instead of one hour and a half on the schedule, and reconvene at 2 p.m.?

Many people, I understand, have planes to catch tomorrow afternoon. I think this would be the most effective utilization of the delegates.

President Fuzak: We will make that adjustment, unless there is some serious objection. It is impossible to go later than that, because there is other business of the Council, the Nominating Committee and other items, so that 6:30 is as late as we could go. We can start at 8 a.m. tomorrow, go until 1 p.m. and have one hour for lunch instead of a longer period.

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): President Fuzak, delegates, I have a brief statement for Division III Steering Committee which I hope will clear up a discussion that took place in our final round table yesterday.

Our original intent has been and was to request the chair to rule Proposal No. 100, Part B, out of order for Division III. Part B is out of order, as I understand it; and I will be corrected by the chair, since the existing financial aid program is already more restrictive than Part B proposes. The reference, if you want to take your Manual, the reference to existing Division III restrictions in the existing Manual is found in Bylaw 11, Section 2, Paragraph 8.

If you could keep your finger there, the conflict with Proposal No. 100 is Section 9-(b) which would permit tuition and mandatory fees without need, which would be in conflict with the reference I just have made. Since the decision of the chair and the parliamentarian is that this request—there is some doubt whether it can be declared out of order and certainly it would take some discussion—Division III has decided in our round table to vote down Part A, thereby removing Division III from any vote on No. 100-B.

Division III wants to make it very clear that the reason for these several requests is the fact that our existing legislation is already more restrictive than Proposal No. 100 with regard to need. And, finally, assuming Division III will disapprove Part A, we will then have no part in the roll call vote of Proposal No. 100, Part B.

President Fuzak: Because you have more restrictive regulations does not make A out of order. This applies to amendments to amend-

ments. So the parliamentarian and I agree, that is, Part A is in order and can accomplish your purpose by voting it down.

Mr. Smith: That can be by paddle vote in the interest of time?

President Fuzak: Yes.

14. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Paul F. Dietzel (Ohio Valley Conference): Is it in order to speak to No. 100?

President Fuzak: Yes. We have not closed debate, yet.

Mr. Dietzel: I think all of us were very impressed with the very eloquent discussion from the many presidents who are here; and I certainly am very impressed, too, that they have taken the time, as I am sure all of us are, to come to this Convention.

I think perhaps this is the first time for some of them to see NCAA in action, but the view they give us from the top is most beneficial. However, I would like to give a view from the bottom. I would like to talk in terms of athletes that we are discussing. This is going to be rather personal.

I am commissioner of the Ohio Valley Conference; but I do not speak for the conference, since I have not talked with all our presidents about this. I feel that we have a basic philosophical point here. I would think only back a few years when I graduated from high school, if we had had the need proposal in then, because my father was a very hard worker, even though he was just a skilled worker, it would have been my proposition to have had to pay my way through school.

If my father had not been working and been on relief, for example, I could have gotten to go to school free. Now, I wonder about the philosophy which places the onus on whether you get a scholarship or not based on what your father does. I think all coaches, people who have been in the coaching business, basically, are opposed to this. Scholarships, in our opinion, should be based on the boy himself, what he does and what his potential is, not on his background. For that reason, I basically am philosophically opposed to any scholarship based on need for athletics.

Gil Canale (Northern Michigan University): I move to table all proposals on financial need at this time. I don't think that we, as delegates, can honestly say we have sufficient information, in fact, on what effect the proposal . . .

President Fuzak: I am sorry. Your motion to table is not debatable. Make your motion, and we will see whether there is a second. Then we will proceed to vote.

Mr. Canale: I move to table all proposals on financial aid at this time.

President Fuzak: You can only table one, presumably No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Horn: I have a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not true since this Convention has voted to have a roll call on the issue, that all motions that will be made that will affect the main issue will also have a roll call?

President Fuzak: I believe that is correct. Just a moment. I have to confer with the parliamentarian.

Richard Lyman (Stanford University): A point of order. I don't know the gentleman who made the motion to table, but is it per-

missible to give him the opportunity to withdraw that motion, rather than putting us through a series of roll call votes?

President Fuzak: Do you wish to withdraw your motion?

Mr. Canale: I do not wish to withdraw the motion.

President Fuzak: Well, I guess we have no alternative but to proceed. Since there is no debate on that . . .

Andrew Brown (Southwestern Athletic Conference): In keeping with the gentleman from the Division III going on record as saying they were going to defeat the proposal as written, No. 100, I would like to bring it to the attention of the chairman they did participate in a vote to have a roll call vote. Maybe it is appropriate to have another vote for a roll call.

President Fuzak: Not at this point. Our motion before us is one to table. I think it might be that Division III—if it is their intent, but it has not been determined. I will call on the chairman of the Division III Steering Committee for that.

Mr. Smith: The intent was not to vote against Part B of No. 100. The intent was simply to remove us from a vote on Part B No. 100, as I explained earlier.

President Fuzak: Well, in other words, however, you would not be affected by it?

Mr. Smith: It is our desire or our understanding that we will not be affected by No. 100-B.

President Fuzak: But in this tabling vote, all institutions in Division III must be called.

Mr. Smith: Is there any way we can get out of that?

President Fuzak: The only alternative is to vote yes, no or abstain.

J. D. Morgan (UCLA): A point of order. Since the tabling vote is on No. 100 and we have voted to have a roll call vote on that, I would like to move that we have a show of paddle vote on the tabling motion which is different from No. 100 as an item.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Fuzak: I am afraid that motion is out of order, J. D. Unfortunately, we are caught in that trap. In effect, it amounts to voting on the main proposition through an indirect proposition.

Mr. Smith: Do I understand the Division III can abstain if it is necessary that we have to go through this?

President Fuzak: That is up to each individual voter in Division III.

William Dioguardi (Montclair State College): Is it appropriate that we vote on 100-A and then 100-B separately, or must we vote on the entirety?

President Fuzak: Right at the moment we will be voting on a tabling motion and not on either A or B.

Mr. Smith: Would the mover, in the interest of time, move that the tabling item be voted on on B?

President Fuzak: I don't believe that is in order. I think our parliamentarian is saying that is not in order because the motion to table is to table 100, A and B. The question has been called.

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): In view of the fact that the mover of the tabling motion would not withdraw it, would the seconder withdraw his second?

President Fuzak: Unfortunately, in a body of this size, it is very

difficult to identify the seconder. I guess it would have to be a good deal of trust involved.

Mr. Koenig: May I raise a question whether or not there was, indeed, a second to the motion?

President Fuzak: Yes, there was a second. I heard one. It was rather distinct. I fact, there were several. That is why it is difficult to determine it. Since the seconder is impossible to identify, since the mover is unwilling to withdraw his motion, we must proceed. May I have your attention, please.

As many as are in favor of the adoption of the tabling motion will, as your names are called, say *yes* or *no*. The Secretary will call the roll. There will be no explanations, no speeches, just *yes* or *no*. We will get underway. We have them in a particular order and it will be very difficult. We have the names of the registered institutions and those that are registered at the Convention. I think it is right up to date. We will call the name of the institution and the Secretary will repeat so we are certain we are getting it right.

[When enough *no* votes were recorded in Division I to defeat the motion to table, Mr. Canale of Northern Michigan University withdrew the motion, and no further roll call vote was taken. The record of the partial roll call is on file in the NCAA national office.]

President Fuzak: We are back to the main question. I promised Father Joyce he would be next.

Edmund Joyce (Notre Dame University): My text today is taken from Daniel verses 16-22. [Laughter] I do feel something like Daniel in the lion's den. Here I am, a mere vice-president, venturing to place myself in opposition to a group of presidents who spoke with feeling and eloquence in favor of Proposal No. 100. I can now better understand the succinct statement made by one delegate in 1973 when we last debated the need factor. Very few people then spoke in favor of the need factor, but one gentleman did stand up and say, "My president is for this. I urge you to vote for it."

Now, we realize that presidents are men of uncommon wisdom and for awhile this morning they seemed to have considerable unanimity in regard to a position on the need factor. With all deference to them, however, I should like to explain why many people with years of experience in college athletics sincerely oppose the imposition of a need factor, particularly in the highly competitive sports of football and basketball.

Many of these reasons were not brought out in the debate which took place this morning. I listened carefully to the arguments made by the presidents this morning. They could be subsumed under two headings. Number one, but not the most important, was the economic issue. A few speakers, if they will pardon my saying so, waxed hyperbolic in discussing this feature. Some seemed to make the success of Title IX hinge on the adoption of a need factor. As a matter of fact, we do not really know whether there would be any substantial savings or not. I take it this is the reason for the University of Michigan's resolution, which is to follow the present one.

Certainly, the prospect of savings could vary quite a bit from school to school. Argument number two, and the one expressed by Chancellor Young of UCLA and President Lyman of Stanford Uni-

versity hinged on the philosophy that athletes, when it comes to financial aid, should not be given special privileges unavailable to the general student.

They deplore having "a specially marked group." Carried to a logical extreme, this leads, I think, to the Ivy League position which deplores athletic scholarships as such. Now, I have no argument with any school which endorses this philosophy, whether it be to have no athletic grants-in-aid or whether all financial aid, including athletics, must be on the basis of proven need. Frankly, I think most of the schools in this room ought to be happy to adopt the need principle given the financial crisis which besets most of higher education. I know if I were in Division III or Division II, I would wholeheartedly favor the need factor.

I can find no justification in my own mind for using operating or endowment income to bring in a good wrestler at the cost of losing a fine mathematician. In Division I, however, you have an entirely different situation, particularly in those institutions which have major programs in football and basketball.

To understand this, you have to be prepared to admit that college football and basketball are unique phenomena on the American cultural scene. This is openly deplored by some presidents, begrudgingly accepted by others and enthusiastically embraced by practically none. Even those that recognize the positive contributions these sports have made to their new institutions, prefer to remain silent, rather than risk snide remarks from their peers. In any event, my opposition to Proposal No. 100 is based on the premise that we do have a unique situation in regard to college football and basketball, and the competition for all national recognition among our institutions is continuing and fierce.

The starting point of this competition is in the recruiting process. We, in the NCAA, have spent years of hard work trying to ensure that this competition is honest and fair to all schools. Many of you college presidents, I believe, are too young, perhaps, to remember the days when athletic grants-in-aid were frowned upon by many institutions. Those were the days when student-athletes had to earn their way through school by working at such jobs as turning on the lights in the football stadium once a month. As a wise and experienced delegate said at our debate on need in 1971, the most honest step ever taken by the NCAA was to recognize the legitimacy of the full grant-in-aid to athletes.

Remember, we are talking about outstanding athletes, each of whom is being recruited by anywhere from five to 15 institutions. The full grant-in-aid has been canonized by a quarter century of usage. It has given our coaches a uniform base from which to operate. It has rendered unnecessary clandestine inducements.

Furthermore, the concept of a full grant-in-aid has gained the assent of most outstanding athletes and their families. The boy is proud that he can relieve his family of financial support for his education. The family is proud for the son's sake. To reverse this practice now and force the parents to go through a distasteful and perhaps demeaning financial disclosure when it is the school which badly wants their son, is not going to sit well with the families involved. They know as well as we do that their son's efforts will generate far

more revenue for the school than the cost of his grant-in-aid. Whether you like it or not, many of these families will feel exploited and will justify in their own minds being devious or perhaps even dishonest in their financial disclosures.

What really makes me question the wisdom and practicality and fairness of a need concept being imposed on schools that are competing for blue-chip football and basketball players are the examples given by many speakers in 1973 that were not mentioned this morning. Basically, these speakers, one after another, attempted to show that there is no way of really administering financial aid equitable on the basis of a simple form. It doesn't matter so much for the general run of students if there are some inequities. It matters a great deal if the family of your right guard is paying \$700 a year and the family of your right tackle is paying nothing, particularly if the latter's family is living more affluently.

Some of these examples, I will give to you. One, for instance, pointed out that certainly a \$10,000 income in a small Texas town is not the equivalent of \$10,000 for a family in Chicago. Another example was the case where you had an industrious man and wife, both working very hard to raise their status in this world and earning a combined income of, say, \$11,000. Now, they would be forced to pay \$500 for their son, where the family down the street who was improvident would pay nothing.

We also know, and it was pointed out time and time again, that the bottom form on the Federal income tax returns don't always tell the truth. Many affluent families certainly wind up showing very little income there, even though they say they are pretty well to do.

We also recognize that many families have heavy financial burdens and responsibilities that in no way show up on their income tax forms. The NCAA Committee has humanly tried to give the families an opportunity. In Section E of the form devised, it discloses these facts and enables them to ask for exceptional treatment.

Someone said this morning that it would only cost pennies to administer the need plan. It seems to me that this is being extraordinarily naive. I submit to you it will take a sizeable staff just to process intelligently the thousands of forms which come pouring into the NCAA office. How would any one of you like to sit in judgment on each person that is asking for special consideration under Section E of the current form? Would the judgment be at your desk, or would you have to send out a field investigator? There are other examples of inequities in this plan, but I shall not belabor the point. One thing came through loud and clear three years ago; and that was because of the validity of these facts, that our coaches generally were vehemently opposed to the introduction of a need factor.

The number of them who had lived with it under certain circumstances before in their careers without exception stood up and told us we were making a big mistake if we pursued this line. I was going to quote a few of them and some of them have already spoken for themselves.

Ed Crowder pointed out wisely at that time that when you have this kind of inequity, you are bound to have some subterfuge. Bob

Blackman, reporting on his experience in the Ivy League, pointed out that yes, surely, the schools were very honest and the plan seemed to work as far as they were concerned, but there would be family dishonesty no matter how honest the school would be.

Duffy Doherty, some will remember his saying he never felt so much like a hypocrite as he did when this program was in effect in the Big Ten. He even went so far as to say, "I will never coach under a program that involves the need factor."

Earl Edwards, the president of the Coaches' Association at that time, reported on the poll that he had taken with the coaches in the University Division before reorganization, where they voted 9-1 against the need factor. He wisely pointed out that for such a rule ever to work, it would require rather complete acceptance and cooperation of the football coaches themselves. He indicated that we had better improve the atmosphere if we are going to assemble something like this.

Finally, Bill Wall, speaking as president of the Basketball Coaches' Association, said his people had been polled and they were unanimously opposed to the need factor and felt it was simply unworkable.

I think it behooves us to listen to our football coaches. They are, on the whole, honest, sincere, hardworking men. It doesn't seem quite fair to me at times for a president to tell a coach, whether implicitly or explicitly, that you would like for him to go out and win a national championship and then give him unrealistic rules which he has to operate under.

If there is one thing that I devoted my attention to in college athletics, it has been to ensure the integrity and the honesty of the game. I hope to live long enough to see that dream realized where we will not be under suspicion or under clout from the public, whether abroad or at home, for unfortunate practices.

I think that in passing something like this, we are being unrealistic and holding the door to abuses which I hate to see come about.

Finally—I will sit down and apologize for taking this much time—but it helps me make my final point. I think the fact this has taken so much time of this entire Convention really points up dramatically how important it is for us to have further divisions within the NCAA. Then we can sit down and discuss in the groups that are vitally interested in specific problems, those problems, and come to a resolution ourselves without involving the time and patience of so many important people. [Applause]

Charley Scott (University of Alabama): I do not want to move the previous question because of the requirement for a roll call but may the question be considered?

President Fuzak: Yes. We are back on the original motion at this point, which was divided into A and B. A will be before you first.

William Baughn (University of Colorado): Without arguing the issue, could we get some clarification as to how the parts are going to be handled in Division I? This applies to sports other than football and basketball. I believe in Division II partial applies across the board to football and basketball. If these partials can be spread over more people and awarded according to family need, it doesn't seem we are going to save any money. In other words, I would like

a ruling from the committee as to how these compensations are going to be made.

Jack Larsen (University of Southern California): There is no question that financial aid based on need, when applied to an institution that has say Division II in all sports and in Division I in all sports other than football, does not effect any change in the volume of dollar equivalencies available. It does not. Therefore, if an institution chooses to spend its total package and spread the cost to 300 people, there is nothing to prevent it.

Don Warhurst (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): Along that same line, in the event Proposal No. 100 would not pass and we were dealing with a young man who did not qualify for aid based on financial need, then would his equivalency become mandatory fees or retain the elements that we have used heretofore; that is, board and room?

Mr. Larsen: The educational equivalency, as specified in the No. 100, does include tuition and fees. The only difference or the only significant feature about tuition and fees is that it doesn't get subject to need. Therefore, if you do grant specific student-athletes tuition and fees only, that goes toward your total educational equivalent allowance.

If you have 11 scholarships in this sport and you grant 11 tuition scholarships, that can be done with no consideration of need. Then, you have a pot full of your remaining equivalency represented by room and board and books, up to \$150, to give to other student-athletes.

Mr. Warhurst: Do I understand—I am not sure I understood your answer—in the event the student did not qualify for financial aid, would his equivalency factor then become just tuition and fees, or not?

Mr. Larsen: That is right. We recognize your equivalent factor is in terms of dollars. They are total dollars. If you give a student-athlete, who does not qualify for room and board and books based on need, a tuition scholarship that takes a chunk of your total equivalent pocket away, the dollar amount. Say tuition and fees are two-thirds of your total educational equivalency defined in O.I. 100. If you give a tuition only plus fees grant, then that accounts for two-thirds of one of your 10 whole grants.

Mr. Smith: Just to reaffirm for Division III, if we defeat portion A, by a paddle vote or otherwise, we will not be voting on portion B?

President Fuzak: That is correct. It is voted in two separate sections. Part A applies only to Division III, as to the determination whether you want that under B. Are you ready for the question? We are voting on A. That is the first part of the question.

[Part A of Proposal No. 100 (page A-43) was defeated by Division III, excluding that division from further voting on the proposal.]

Ernest C. Casale (Temple University): In view of that vote, I should like to move that we reconsider the vote for a roll call vote, since Division III would not be involved now.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Fuzak: It has been seconded. Your basis is, sir, that

there may have been some Division III votes in determining whether there would be a roll call vote or not?

Mr. Casale: Yes.

President Fuzak: That is in order. The vote is now to reconsider whether we shall have a roll call vote, and it is only for Divisions I and II members voting on that matter.

[The motion to reconsider having a roll call vote was approved by Divisions I and II. Divisions I and II then voted not to have a roll call vote for Part B of Proposal No. 100.]

We will vote by divisions. Division I will vote first and then Division II. We will vote by a paddle.

Richard Post (San Jose State University): Point of order. Was there a two-thirds vote on that vote to reconsider?

President Fuzak: You don't need a two-thirds vote. Robert's Rules of Order required for passage, a motion to reconsider.

Harold Abel (Central Michigan University): A point of order. Is it in order in the midst of a roll call—that is the roll call vote again on the motion to table, based on the other—is it appropriate at this time to take a vote on whether or not to have a roll call vote, having begun the process in the tabling motion?

President Fuzak: The process was not begun in the tabling motion. I think the point was well taken by the proposer of the reconsideration motion that there were Division III members voting on the roll call vote who would not be concerned with the issues now. I ruled on this basis, it was proper to have a reconsideration motion. The roll call had not been undertaken, merely the question of tabling.

Mr. Abel: May I request a division based on the motion to reconsider, please?

President Fuzak: Yes, that is your privilege. The Voting Committee will please assume your positions. This motion is on whether or not to reconsider. We are going back to a question of whether to reconsider.

Mr. Horn: I have a parliamentary inquiry. Are you going to take that vote by Divisions I and II?

President Fuzak: The vote on this is a majority of the body, of those concerned in the issue, as to whether to reconsider the roll call vote. The vote on the main motion itself will be by divisions.

Mr. Horn: The only reason I raise the question, and the reason I asked the earlier question when the motion was made to table, everybody knows a motion to table is usually a motion to kill the issue and to fuzz up why it was killed and to get off the hook.

That is why we insisted on the roll call, although we didn't start the motion to table. But what worries me in this whole process is some assumptions that have been made by Division III. It would seem, based on that paddle show, the assumption might be correct. On the other hand, if we look at the motion to table, it was overwhelmingly rejected by Division I. I suggest that it might be appropriate on reconsideration to get a clearer count between the two divisions, since there are a lot of different interests at play.

President Fuzak: Our process or our division will be taken. I will rule that we take it, and a majority of the body, not by division. That will be Division I and Division II voting.

Richard Lyman (Stanford University): I want to ask whether it was in order for the chair to proceed to vote on the motion to reconsider without calling for any debate or discussion or even allow reasonable time therefore.

President Fuzak: I looked around and no one was approaching a microphone, sir. If it was too hurried, I am sorry. But the vote was undertaken.

Mr. Lyman: Would you wish to reconsider that decision?

President Fuzak: No. We are now in the process. The vote count has been asked for. The Voting Committee is ready. The issue is to get a count on the earlier vote to reconsider, whether or not to reconsider. A vote for, means you wish to reconsider; a vote against, means you do not wish to reconsider. This is for Division I and II only. It is not for Division III. What we are doing is reconsidering whether or not to have a roll call. The question is to get a count on whether we should reconsider or not. In other words, the gentlemen asked for a count on the motion.

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): I want to be clear on this.

President Fuzak: The request was to get a count on the first of the two votes which was taken. That vote was that Ernie Casale moved to reconsider in view of the fact that Division III was no longer concerned. We took that vote and it seemed obvious that it carried.

Now, a request for counting has been made, and we are counting that vote. In other words, we are going back to the vote taken before the actual vote on whether to have a roll call vote or not, which makes it awkward, to say the least. We are really voting on whether or not to reconsider the vote. All we are doing is getting a paddle vote count. This is not the vote on whether or not to get a roll call.

I am trying to be fair and I guess we caused some problems. Now, remember, we are back to that vote as to whether to reconsider, and the reconsideration relates to whether to take a roll call vote or not. The reconsideration vote is the one we are counting.

[The count on the vote to reconsider reaffirmed President Fuzak's earlier declaration that the motion was approved, 237-114.]

The subsequent vote, then, decided against having a roll call vote. That was officially determined. Now, President Lyman.

Mr. Lyman: I guess I don't understand that point. I thought we had now voted to reconsider the matter of a roll call vote and were ready for discussion on that question.

President Fuzak: No, sir, that is incorrect. We voted to reconsider, and I ruled that it had passed. Subsequently, we took a second vote, and that was not to have a roll call vote and its result. The gentleman got up and requested a count on the reconsideration vote, so we went back. We skipped the actual vote and went over that to the reconsideration vote. I probably should not have permitted that. In leaning over backwards, I did.

Richard Nelson (Northern Illinois University): If this is permissible, it is similar to a motion to reconsider, I move we have a roll call in Division I on this motion.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Lyman: I just want to make the brief statement, and in a way

it is repetitious of something I said earlier today. The eyes of the public are on this meeting. It is not going to look very savory if we are not willing to stand up and be counted on this important issue. We have honest differences of opinion; but nobody, in my hearing so far, has claimed it an unimportant, insignificant issue. Let us be heard.

[The motion for a roll call vote in Division I was defeated, 99-124.]

President Fuzak: You now are ready to vote by divisions with a paddle vote. Division I will be first. We are voting on Proposal No. 100. Of course, it is the Part B of Proposal 100.

Mike Mullally (Eastern Illinois University): Since Division I had the opportunity of whether they want a roll call, I believe that Division II also should have that opportunity to vote for a roll call vote. I move, therefore, that Division No. II have a roll call vote.

[The motion was seconded and defeated by Division II.]

President Fuzak: Now, the question before you in Division II is Proposal No. 100-B.

[Proposal No. 100-B (page A-43) received a 119-119 vote in Division I and was defeated 48-75 by Division II.]

Stephen Goodspeed (University of California, Santa Barbara): I request a roll call vote in Division I.

President Fuzak: I think perhaps we had better have a roll call vote so there will be no doubt about the results.

[Proposal No. 100-B (page A-43) in a roll call vote by Division I was defeated 112-120, see Appendix J (page A-151) for a record of the vote.]

President Fuzak: I just want to make a comment. Regardless of the way you feel, this is obviously a very, very serious area and we have had, I think, some differences, strong differences. I hope that the result will not tend to fragment us, but we can go from here without any hard feelings.

Resolution: Determination of Financial Need

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan): If it is in order, I should like to move the adoption of Resolution No. 100-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

The resolution provides that each member will keep a record during the coming year of all initial awards of grants-in-aid and will require the parents of those students to fill out the forms and furnish the data, and that each institution then keep track of the amount it would have saved if No. 100 had been in effect.

In September, the institutions will furnish this information to the NCAA; and in October, the Association will circulate the information without identifying institutions. On the basis of that information which goes only to the amount that would have been saved, the Council shall present, if it feels it advisable, to the 71st Convention, such recommendations that seem appropriate. This is the legislation by resolution and would be in effect only until the 71st Annual Convention.

Kenneth Weller (Central College, Iowa): Could I request an interpretation of the role of Division III in this vote?

President Fuzak: All members of the body may vote on this issue.

You may, if you wish, abstain, since the matter, at least at this point does not affect you. Only the Bylaws are divided, so it is entirely up to you whether you wish to vote or not. The vote is of a majority of the total body assembled.

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): Could I ask a question of Marcus Plant, please? The resolution called for a determination of this on or before September 1. There could be a problem of determination after the student reports to the institution September 1. He could be a walk-on who is granted aid. I would like an explanation from Marcus. Would this refer to the students who have received grants-in-aid and who have signed a letter of intent, that sort of student, is that correct?

Mr. Plant: That is correct. That is the intention. I think as a practical matter, it would not require us to furnish information as to grants-in-aid made after September 1.

Lloyd Watkins (West Texas State University): If this passes, do we give a determination of the amount of money which would be saved on the need basis? Do you include in the savings the amount of money that you would relieve from that money budgeted by having a number of these students who would be in a need determination funded through Federal programs when they are not funded now through the Federal programs?

If at our institution we could finance a substantial part of the athletic grant-in-aid through BEOG's or SOG, work study or whatever, it would provide a substantial relief to the athletic department budget. I am not quite sure, then, precisely how you would determine what is meant by "saving money." I am all for the proposal, but I don't know how to figure it out. I wonder if we could be addressed to that point.

Mr. Plant: The intention underlying it is to have a dry run as if No. 100 had passed. If you could have saved this money under No. 100, then it should be counted a savings.

Mr. Watkins: Save the money from the athletic budget?

Mr. Plant: No, saving money, no matter what the source of the money is. How much would you have spent less than your commitments during 1976, than you would have spent if No. 100 had passed.

Mr. Watkins: We will have a final aid budget for the institution. Very few athletes currently are being funded from various Federal programs. They are being funded from the finances of the inter-collegiate athletic department made up of student fees, gate receipts, and so forth.

Mr. Plant: But it would be what they could have funded if No. 100 would have passed.

Mr. Watkins: Yes, they are under Federal programs.

Mr. Plant: Then you take into consideration the amount of money you might have saved.

Mr. Watkins: Not in the total institutional budget, but in the athletic department?

Mr. Plant: The aid application.

Earl Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Item 2 of the resolution states, "Each active member of the Association making an initial award in 1976 of financial aid not based on need to one

or more student-athletes, female or male, shall require the recipient to file with it a financial aid application." [Appendix I]

My question is concerned with the enforcement of that. Would the requirement of this have the university to deny entrance to any student or family rejecting this?

Mr. Plant: I wouldn't think it necessarily would deny entrance, but it would withhold financial aid until the resolution was complied with. It is effective as legislation, as much as if it were a Bylaw.

Keith Broman (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): Did I understand that the resolution has the same binding nature, enforcement and so forth, as a Bylaw?

Mr. Plant: Yes.

President Fuzak: But it is temporary in nature and lasts for only one year.

[Proposal No. 100-2 (page A-31) was defeated.]

Financial Aid

Lew Comer (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I move No. 101 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 101 is simply to allow a student-athlete whose need is determined to be greater than the "commonly accepted educational expenses," to receive aid that is not counted in determining equivalencies. We have been told by the financial aid officer that we are discriminating if we don't have this in effect.

Ralph Fadum (North Carolina State University): On behalf of the Council, I wish to oppose the adoption of Proposal No. 101, parts A and B. With respect to A, the proposal provides that aid based on need as determined by the financial aid officer of an institution shall be allowed in spite of the fact that this may exceed the usual expenses. It is, however, no commonly accepted need listed among the various institutions. Some may include food plus tuition. Others may also include travel, incidentals and other expenses. Thus, there would be inequality among institutions, thereby, defeating having financial aid at all.

Now, B states, "Aid granted in excess of commonly accepted educational expenses which is based on need as determined by the financial aid office shall not be counted as administering the equivalencies procedure." The word corresponding to an equivalency will vary depending on the institutional definition of need. Thus, too, this defeats the purpose of having a financial aid limitation.

[Proposal No. 101 (page A-44) was defeated.]

[Proposals Nos. 102 and 103 (page A-45) were withdrawn.]

Financial Aid

John Coyle (Pennsylvania State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale very simply is to reinstate the incidental expense of \$15. Mention has been made several times of the differences allowed to student-athletes and other people eligible for aid. I think it is equitable to reinstate it.

[Proposal No. 104 (page A-46) was defeated.]

Financial Aid

Mr. Coyle: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 105. The rationale is the same.

[Proposal No. 105 (page A-46) was seconded and defeated.]

[Proposal No. 106 (page A-46) was not introduced.]

Financial Aid

Joseph Ruetz (Stanford University): I move the approval or adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

This particular proposal is attempting to, I think, attack the problem that was under recruiting, whereby students are offered letters of intent without there having been a formal application or even a transcript on file in the admissions office so decisions could be made as to whether or not the student himself is eligible for admission. It is for this particular reason that I think, educationally, we should have formal application the same as other students and a transcript on file before the written tender of a grant-in-aid is offered.

[Proposal No. 107 (page A-47) was defeated, 229-179, two-thirds majority needed for approval.]

[Proposal No. 108 (page A-47) was withdrawn.]

Financial Aid

William Ferguson (University of Illinois, Champaign): I move the adoption of No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this particular amendment is to correct what appears to be an inequity in the grant-in-aid program. It is now possible for a student in the fall semester or fall quarter to voluntarily withdraw from the sport, and the current language requires the grant-in-aid to extend for the full calendar year.

The thrust of this proposal is to enable it to be withdrawn after the term in question. There are adequate protections for the run-off situation. This is to protect the university from the walk-on situation.

Carl James (Duke University): I would like to support this proposal. I think it is a great one. Each university has a moral obligation, when the student walks off, to inform the financial aid office. What this will do is relieve the burden of expense from the athletic department in that spring semester. It is a sound and good proposal.

[Proposal No. 109 (page A-47) was approved.]

Financial Aid

Ernest Casale (Temple University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 110. I think the intent is quite clear.

[Proposal No. 110 (page A-48) was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 111 (page A-48) was withdrawn.]

Maximum Awards

William Baughn (University of Colorado): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal applies only to sports other than football and bas-

ketball. Its purpose is to provide flexibility to schools that have a heavy scholarship commitment in some of these sports prior to August, 1975. This will allow the school to continue to work the numbers down and still bring in some new talent, without having to pressure not to renew existing awards.

Harry Cross (University of Washington): Originally, I was in favor of this, but I am not now, for the reason that it eliminates from the counting some who have already been counted. I think we do need more time to get down to the numbers. I call to your attention Proposal No. 113 from my conference which gives us another year to get down. I think this is a more desirable thing than to just take a whole group of them out of the counting process entirely.

[Proposal No. 112 (page A-48) was defeated by Division I.]

Maximum Awards

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference): In behalf of the Pacific-8 Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is self-explanatory. It delays the implementation of compliance for one year.

[Proposal No. 113 (page A-49) was defeated by Division I.]

Maximum Awards

William Putnam (University of South Carolina): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the intent is rather obvious. This is to eliminate the limitation on the number of awards which may be in effect in the same year in the sport of football while retaining the present limitation of 30 initial awards per year.

[Proposal No. 114 (page A-50) was defeated by Division I football.]

Maximum Awards

Keith Broman (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I move approval of Proposal No. 115 to amend Article 5, Section 5-(c). I would like to speak to it for a moment.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the Special Convention last August, we passed legislation which reduced the number of overall scholarships to 95. I was told by correspondence with the NCAA that the meeting of last summer did not change the effective date.

Proposal No. 115 hopefully corrects the omission of the effective date which was not proposed last summer. I am asking on the basis of what seems logical that the 95 be for the 1978-79 academic year. For schools that have large number of scholarships this would prevent run-offs, and I would appeal to the conscience of those schools who do not have large numbers to vote for this.

[Proposal No. 115 (page A-50) was defeated by Division I football.]

Maximum Awards

David Strack (University of Arizona): In behalf of the Western Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 116.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you will recall, the intent of this is to eliminate initial awards in the sport of basketball while retaining the present limitation of 15 awards which may be in effect in the same year. The rationale behind this system under which it now operates was explained by Bill Orwig last summer.

He introduced the maximum football award amendment. I will take the liberty of quoting Bill. "The overall limit is necessary for economy and balance and an initial evidence necessary to eliminate tryout-runoff situations. It may well be in football the number that football allows, both initially and overall, that the runoff could be a serious problem. But it is really inconceivable to me to think a basketball coach with a 15 total, would be able to resort to a runoff. In addition, I think this is very important relative to an overall limit."

I call to your attention in basketball we have unfortunately a unique attrition problem, the signing of the undergraduate by the profession. At the University of Arizona, we lost two young men in one year. The last three years, the universities in this country have had over 50 young men to sacrifice a number of years eligibility or more to sign with the professionals.

My question is how do we, under a six initial and 10 limit, within two years, ever replace these young men? It seems obvious that the situation can become more critical. I would like to give you an example of what I think might happen. That is at a university which has 15 in operation, and it may graduate five, three could quit for some reason or another and two could sign with the professionals. The only thing that would help the coach is he wouldn't have to worry about the travel.

I was fortunate enough to coach basketball in the Big Ten at one time in my career. We operated, the Big Ten, under the initial awards system. It happened to us there. Ohio State University came across a very unfortunate situation and it was necessary for the Big Ten to make the necessary move to change those so they could operate.

I don't want this to happen in the NCAA. It seems very obvious to me that the 15-man total handles all our questions. It is economical, it is very fair throughout the country and it doesn't allow anyone to have any more players than the others. It is simple to operate.

I am aware of the fact that many hold the initial awards count in most sports sacred, but I would hope for the sake of basketball you give this amendment serious consideration.

John Hook (Pan American University): I should like to encourage your support of Proposal No. 116 so we may remove this undeserved hardship on the development of the program in basketball.

[Proposal No. 116 (page A-50) was approved by Division I.]

Maximum Awards

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan): I move the adoption of No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

I should like to make a brief statement as to why it is here. A number of gymnastic coaches feel they were treated unjustly in

the August Special Convention in reducing this maximum number to seven. They point out that they require 12 people in their competitions and wrestling only has 10 weights. The wrestling maximum was set at 10. These coaches feel that they are handicapped, and I agreed to put this before this Convention. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 117 (page A-51) was defeated by Division I.]

Maximum Awards

Mr. Daniel Miller (Indiana University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 118 for Division I.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the 1972 Olympics, the United States won 33 gold medals. Seventeen, or 52 per cent, were in the sports of swimming and diving. If you count the gold, silver and bronze, the United States won 93. Of these 93, 46 per cent were in swimming and diving.

There are strong voices in the Association for improvement of the U.S. position in the Olympics. I fear that the drastic cut from 19 to 11 in maximum awards in swimming allowed at the August Convention will, in fact, deteriorate our position. I request support for this proposal to return a modest number of awards, because of the special international implications.

[Proposal No. 118 (page A-51) was defeated by Division I.]

Maximum Awards

Bob McKinley (Trinity University): Actually, Trinity University introduced this legislation; and when it was found out we were Division I in tennis and Division III in all other sports, we could not propose this legislation. We called on Pan American and Texas Christian to at least propose it to get it on the floor. I should like to ask one of these representatives to propose it, if they will.

Kenneth Herrick (Texas Christian University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. McKinley: Trinity University is in complete agreement with the spirit of the Chicago Convention back in August where the scholarships were cut back. We felt, however, that the cut back was made on a percentage basis without any regard to the individual sports and what it takes to hold each sport.

To hold a tennis match, it takes a minimum of six persons. So we feel that coaches ought to be allowed to have at least six scholarships to fill and complete the team.

[Proposal No. 119 (page A-51) was defeated by Division I.]

Maximum Awards

C. D. Henry (Big Ten Conference): I move adoption of Proposal 120 in Division No. I.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is obvious. It is to have initial awards in the sport of wrestling. The Big Ten coaches are interested in economy by preventing the run-off. The wrestling coaches in the Big Ten are not requesting this from a position of weakness. In the Big Ten Conference, it has the defending national champion, and seven teams that finished in the top 20. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 120 (page A-52) was defeated by Division I.]

Maximum Awards

Lew Comer (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I move No. 121 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was at the Special Convention in August as an economy measure, and the original vote on it was a tie vote. After having a recount vote, it was defeated by two votes. We are presenting it again as an economy measure for Division No. II football.

Norm Dahm (Boise State University): Passage of this legislation, of course, would create 45 grants-in-aid for Division II as opposed to 95 in Division I. It creates a wide gap of 50. We are not interested or realistically able to compete at the 95 level. It seems to me this item is tied in with the question of creation of the Division I-A. It seems to me passage of this at this time is premature. I should like to see this tabled until such time as the question of Division I-A will be resolved in this Convention or later. I, therefore, move that No. 121 be tabled.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 121 (page A-52) was tabled by Division II football.]

Multiple Sport Participants

Wendell Basye (University of Oregon): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 122.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is given. The proposal deals with the multiple sports participant and would allow a football player or a basketball player to not be counted in football and basketball if as a multiple sports participant he merely practiced with or competed at the subvarsity level in football or basketball. There are those mixes of track and football or baseball and basketball that are usual. This allows an individual who is not at a varsity level in football or basketball not to be counted in the football or basketball scholarships.

Harry Troxell (University of Colorado): Speaking on behalf of the Council, we would like to oppose this because the Bylaw 5 applies to varsity sports only and this permits, in our interpretation, a funded red-shirt program.

President Fuzak: There was not a formal action to oppose by the Council.

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): I just want to point out very clearly the problems we have had with athletes that are interested in both track and football. Last year at my institution we had already reached our limit in the 30 initial grants for football. We had youngsters that were interested in track who also wanted to try out for football. This precluded them trying out for or even practicing in football. That is the points of that measure.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I would like to see it passed, because I would like to stack some more football scholarships into other sports when we don't give full complement to all sports. I am opposed to it. I do really think it is bad, seriously, as someone mentioned over there, to allow the red shirts. I know I could carry 20 more football scholarships if we passed it.

[Proposal No. 122 (page A-52) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Multiple Sport Participants

Hubert Heitmann (University of California, Davis): I move adoption of No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is a follow-up to one which was defeated last year in the Convention where swimming and water polo were to be combined, similar to track and cross country. The argument at that time was these were separate sports and it was not fair to combine them. There is still the feeling on the part of some that they should in some way protect the athletes who are competing in water polo, so the Council is proposing the solution in this manner, which is the same as in basketball and football, and would mean that those athletes who compete in both water polo and swimming would have to be counted in the sport of swimming.

Richard Post (San Jose State University): I would like to speak against the measure. It would allow an institution, if it so desired—since there are five awards permitted in water polo and 11 in swimming—to have its awards in water polo up to 16 since 11 of them would be counted toward swimming. I think this is an unfair measure.

J. D. Morgan (UCLA): We have been through this about two or three Conventions now, and it hasn't made a great deal of difference in the water polo. I think I gave this assemblage a year ago the numbers that had played water polo that went on to swimming; and in eight years of Olympic Competition, only two water polo players ever scored in the NCAA. Water polo is a totally different game than swimming. I would like to keep the two apart. I urge your vote against this measure.

Daniel Miller (Indiana University): I greatly respect J.D.'s presentation, and I am sure his figures are probably right. However, I don't believe I really understand the principle. If, in fact, it never happened, what is wrong with the rule? If it does happen just occasionally, then it is unfair to the school that does not have water polo as compared to the school that is available to use an occasional guy for swimming. You understand that the swimming maximum awards are still very low, so an occasional guy might make a difference. If it so happened so seldom, what is wrong with the rule? I support this particular legislation.

Mr. Morgan: Once more, just quickly to answer him, I have totally separate coaches for water polo and swimming. If you put the two together, I would not like to put them in competition with one another. They will be in competition with one another, if you put them in swimming.

Robert Woodruff (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): For the same reasons that Coach Broyles gave, that he would like to have extra scholarships, we are in favor of this proposal, because the swimming coach, if we put in water polo, could have four additional scholarships.

[Proposal No. 123 (page A-53) was approved by Division I, 103-61, and defeated by Division II.]

President Fuzak: I should like to point out we are voting under a new policy which was adopted by the Council, where a Bylaw affects two Divisions, then you can't have a different official interpretation

in the two Divisions. It must be adopted by a majority of Divisions I and II together in order to stand as an official interpretation.

Financial Aid Definition

Mickey Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): This had escaped me and I apologize. Nevertheless, we are going to move forward with it. I move Proposal No. 124, amending O.I. 500, be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think, as stated, the intent is relatively clear. It would be to exempt non-institutional monies, but yet those monies administered by the institution's financial aid office, from being included when computing the equivalency factor for sports other than football and basketball.

The problem this would rectify has been created by the general interpretation of any form of institutional financial aid received by a recruited student-athlete, is presumed to be athletically related financial aid. In an effort to provide a maximum of financial aid to student-athletes, at the least actual cost to the institution, our financial aid officers have effectively assembled eight packages and will continue to do so.

Needless to say, this program has provided abuse to our total program in a most efficient financial manner. Now, however, with more stringent numbers within Bylaw 5 for sports other than football and basketball, and the required inclusion of those monies when computing the equivalency percentages, we find ourselves in a position of not being able to provide any financial aid to incoming athletes this fall and in some cases for two years.

Please remember, as you consider this proposal, this does not in any way increase the maximum financial aid allowable for the individual student-athlete. This proposal merely liberalizes the method of computing the equivalency percentages, therefore, the overall total for sports other than football and basketball.

Edwin Saxer (University of Toledo): On behalf of the Council, I should like to point out a couple of features of this proposal which the Council feels undesirable. The first of our concerns rides in the deletion of the words in italics. This deletion has the effect of removing the restrictions on the number of football or basketball players who could be aided since funding through "governmental or private sources" would no longer be defined as financial aid as used in Bylaw 5.

Our second concern lies in the fact that funds being from "private sources" as used in the bold faced type, could be variable and would be limited only by the effectiveness of the school in generating such funding. Since such funding would no longer be defined as accountable financial aid, any current limitations on equivalency could become meaningless because of the obvious advantage coming to those having better access to private sources of funding. It could bring us back to the abuses of such fundings which we have experienced in the past. The Council urges the defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 124 (page A-53) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Financial Aid—Equivalencies

Roy Whistler (Purdue University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reason for this is to clarify O.I. 505-(a) which says that the institution shall count the actual amount of money. The modification which we have proposed is to make this consistent for those institutions which allow the use of books by students and the books are either returned or sold to book stores. The accounting is on the net cost of the use of those books.

[Proposal No. 125 (page A-54) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Coaching Staffs

Olav Kollevoll (Lafayette College): On behalf of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

Should this proposal be adopted, limitations on the size of coaching staffs in football and basketball in Divisions I and II would be abolished. This past Wednesday at our Special Convention, this body tabled Proposal No. 9, which would upset limitations on coaching staffs in all other sports. The reasons for tabling Proposal No. 9 apply also relative to the adoption of Proposal No. 126. At that time, it was strong feeling on the size of coaching staffs, the number of coaches and primarily was an institutional matter or a conference matter. It was not a matter for a national organization such as this.

This restriction imposed by staff limitations in football and basketball have and will create hardships on many institutions. Those of us who sponsor varsity sports, junior varsity sports, freshman teams, say, in lacrosse, will find it almost impossible to staff these programs. Some, like ourselves, are considering 150-pound football. There is no means by which we can staff that program. By eliminating the part-time coaches, a number of institutions who employ a good number of part-time coaches can do so for a lot less money than eliminating the number of full-time coaches.

[Proposal No. 126 (page A-54) was approved in Division II, 59-40, and defeated in Division I.]

President Fuzak: That means Division II jumps from No. 126 to Proposal No. 138. The remainder of these are moot for Division No. II, but Division No. I will continue to vote. It seems to me this is a good stopping point, because I wouldn't want to impose on Division II staying.

Andrew Brown (Southwest Athletic Conference): I rise for a point of clarification, please. In the event the round table discussions gave a mandate to the steering committee, is the steering committee obligated to carry out that mandate. I mean, this took place in the Division II Round Table.

President Fuzak: The steering committees of the divisions have no official standing. We may have to legitimize them a little later.

[The Convention recessed at 6:30 p.m.]

FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

Saturday Morning, January 17, 1976

The session convened at 8 a.m., President John A. Fuzak, presiding.

15. OPENING REMARKS

President Fuzak: May I have your attention, please. I have a few remarks to make as we begin the final day of this Convention's business session. It is obvious that we have a substantial portion of the agenda yet to consider.

I should like to ask the cooperation of the delegates in not attempting to change the order of business of items of special interest, until we have progressed through most of this morning's session. Sometime after 11 a.m., and certainly by 11:30 a.m., we will pause to evaluate the balance of the agenda. At that time it will be proposed that issues considered critical to the business of the Association will be moved from the printed order. That is, the Council will propose moving them. Among those already identified are such matters as the several amendments pertaining to reorganization, the resolutions on women's athletics, No. 275 pertaining to amateur rule of the use of agents, and No. 215 concerning legal costs, as well as others. The NCAA Council members will monitor our progress. As indicated, I will provide an evaluation of the Convention's progress in approximately three to three and one-half hours. Our business session is scheduled until 5 p.m. We will adjourn at 5 p.m. or within a minute or two. If we are in the middle of some piece of business or almost at its conclusion, we will finish through until we complete that piece of business.

One other item I think is of some importance is that our rules do not permit proxy vote. Several delegates have commented about seeing someone holding up several paddles. Only the voting delegates and alternates are permitted to vote. You cannot pass your paddle to someone else to vote by proxy other than the delegate from your particular institution.

There are some paddles, for example, allied conferences, with the right to vote. Some of them will hold up two paddles, but never should be more than two. I just wanted to remind you of that. We are working on some attempted consolidation when we get to the area of squad limitations. Hopefully, it will facilitate dealing with that.

16. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[Proposal No. 127 (page A-54) was withdrawn.]

President Fuzak: No. 128 is moot because it relates to Division II only, and Division II rejected No. 126. No. 129 is before you.

Coaching Staffs

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): On behalf of the Ivy Group, I move Proposal No. 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation is essential for those members who wish to spon-

sor one, two or three secondary football teams. It is essential to our need to have adequate coaching for a junior varsity, a freshman A and a freshman B team. Many of us retain freshmen in eligibility in football, and at the same time have a junior varsity team over and above, or underneath, I should say, that.

At Dartmouth College, and also a number of other members, junior varsity freshmen A and freshmen B teams are in existence. This legislation would permit us to employ two part-time coaches, an additional two, for each secondary team. The two part-time coaches could not recruit but this would enable us to have adequate coaching for these teams.

Over and above that, I want to emphasize each of the secondary teams written in this legislation would have to play a minimum of four contests. We couldn't go out and just schedule one contest in order to get permission to have two additional part-time coaches. Again, it is essential. I urge the membership to support this for members who do have a number of secondary football teams.

[Proposal No. 129 (page A-55) was approved by Division I.]

Coaching Staffs

Andy Geiger (University of Pennsylvania): I move adoption of Proposal No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am moving this in reality on behalf of the Eastern Intercollegiate Athletic football teams, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Cornell, Columbia, Rutledge, the Military Academy and the Naval Academy. Lightweight football is a game that we seven institutions have played on a round-robin basis for many years.

The players must be limited on the day of the game to no more than 158 pounds each. There is no relationship to our varsity teams, although some of our alumni wonder. However, I ask approval of this. These are what we would like to continue. I point out to you that our coaches are part-timers. We spend less than \$10,000 total on this program, and we must continue these kinds of programs for youngsters that have no other opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics. I urge the Convention to support this.

[Proposal No. 130 (page A-56) was approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 131 (page A-56) was withdrawn.]

President Fuzak: No. 132 is now moot. Amendment to amendment No. 132-1 is moot in consequence. Perhaps you wish to mark that in your amendments to amendments. That is No. 132-1. Since the major proposal is moot, that is also moot.

Coaching Staffs

Robert Kurz (Northwestern University): Speaking on behalf of the Big Ten Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

John Pont, athletic director for Northwestern University, has asked me to speak in his behalf. I would hope you would give consideration to the benefits derived by the graduate student who wishes to enter the coaching profession. Inasmuch as this proposal limits the graduate student involvement to coaching only, the inside organization and administration of the program and the actual instruction of the student-athletes can be invaluable.

President Fuzak: The question has been asked and I indicated I would raise that question in behalf of a person who said he had a problem in being here at this time. I promised to raise it. As it is stated, does the individual have to be a graduate student? All it says is he has to be a graduate of that institution, and I guess that is the question. Just as long as he is a graduate and limits that to one year, is that right? One year after his graduation?

Mr. Kurz: Yes.

[Proposal No. 133 (page A-57) was approved by Division I.]

Coaching Staffs

Wendell Basye (University of Oregon): I move Proposal No. 134 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

I now move to amend No. 134 by No. 134-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of No. 134-1 is to make some definition of the words "normal attrition." As you recall, that was one of the exceptions to the taking of effective limitations of coaching staffs. As we have tried to draft it, we now indicate that normal attrition should be defined as the death, retirement or voluntary resignation of an employee, or the discharge or transfer from the athletic department by the employer institution.

It is our belief that this covers the contingencies that might be involved in reaching what is considered normal attrition.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): I would just like to ask a question. Would it mean those transferred to the other departments be allowed to coach?

Mr. Basye: My own impression is that if they were transferred in some department outside of the athletic department, that would be actually normal attrition and they would not be allowed to coach. That is, with one exception. I think the basic legislation would not become effective until August 1, 1976, and this doesn't become effective until August 1976.

[Proposals No. 134-1 (page A-132) and No. 134 (page A-57) were approved by Division I.]

Coaching Staffs

Mickey Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): We wish to withdraw No. 135 now that No. 134, as amended, has been adopted.

Charles Neinas (Big Eight Conference): During the round table discussion, I inquired of the gentleman from the University of Oregon as to the effect of his proposal relative to the current interpretation. He indicated at that time that there basically is no change in the current interpretation by the adoption of No. 134, merely a clarification of "normal attrition."

Therefore, if you wish to apply normal attrition to your current coaching staff, of course, the basic interpretation states that it has to be a written contract or academic tenure. If you wish to apply the normal attrition rule to your current coaching staff, you have to support No. 135. We would move No. 135.

[The motion was seconded.]

Charles Samson (Texas A & M University): A point of information. Is Mr. Neinas's statement correct that, indeed, even with this

action we just took, this means that a coach must have a written contract before this attrition rules takes place?

Mr. Neinas: I will try to answer it. It is my understanding that on August 1, 1976, your football coaching staff has to be reduced to the prescribed limits, unless you have in effect a written contract or there is academic tenure. Now, I think that there is some confusion, because No. 134 clarifies normal attrition; and the thought is that normal attrition, therefore, will prevail to allow you to reduce your coaching staff. It is my understanding that is not true as a result of the adoption of No. 134. No. 135 provides for a normal attrition, and you must meet the mandatory required staff by 1979.

Mr. Samson: That is the interpretation I got, but there was some confusion on the question I raised. I possibly would like to get a clarification of that at this time before we proceed. It certainly would influence my vote.

President Fuzak: Warren Brown confirms that limitation, I believe. It has to be in writing, he indicates.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): A point of clarification. On No. 135, if one school has 15 coaches and another school has eight, the first can keep its 15 if this passes and compete with the school that just has eight until normal attrition takes place, which could be five years, 10 years, if it pays them well enough. Is this a fair question? I would urge defeat of this proposal because many of us have only eight and others have 12 and 15. That is a decided advantage for those who keep those 15 coaches against the schools with eight.

Mr. Holmes: Based on that interpretation which did constitute a misunderstanding on your part, I would urge all of you to vote in favor of this. It does provide an orderly downward process toward meeting the compliance of the requirements. There is a final date of 1979 on this, so that it would not be possible to keep those 15 coaches for 10 or 15 years. The attrition aspect of this, the immediate firing aspect of this, does create problems for many institutions. This would allow an orderly downward procedure meeting the requirements of the staff limitations.

President Fuzak: I'll ask Warren Brown to speak on this.

Warren Brown (NCAA Staff): With the adoption of No. 134, which I understood the gentleman from Oregon to indicate is only a definition of "normal attrition," the adoption of No. 134 does not set aside the requirement that if you are above the limit by the effective date of August 1, 1976, you can be above the limit unless you have written contracts or formal written security of employment commitments. The requirement that it be in writing and formal is still applicable. I hope I have not confused you so far. Even though No. 134 has been adopted as amended, it only talks about normal attrition of these people who after the effective date of the rule have written commitments. It doesn't talk about anybody else. On the date that the rule becomes effective, you must meet the limit, except for those that have written commitments.

Mr. Neinas: I am sorry to belabor on this point, but I would like to remind Coach Broyles the current interpretation stipulates if you have an excess in prescribed limit of coaches after August 1,

you must designate the assistant coaches who may recruit off campus. It was my understanding in the August Convention, Coach Broyles was primarily concerned with a number of recruiters off campus. That still would be restricted if No. 135 is adopted. The only thing that is changed is if you have an excess of assistant coaches, you would not have to terminate their employment.

Mr. Broyles: Let me ask Chuck this. If the eight who can recruit are the same eight who can coach, I would support this. But if they have eight who go out and recruit and keep eight back in coaching, this is a decided advantage to that particular school.

Carl James (Duke University): Warren Brown just gave us a good understanding of enforceable contracts. I would like to know his definition of formal security of employment commitments. In many cases, the assistant coaches have one-year written contracts with an institution. This security is in the head coach's contract. If the head coach makes a verbal commitment, that I have a five-year contract, written with "X" University, is that then to be interpreted as formal security of employment for those assistants for five years?

Mr. Brown: The answer to that would be no. The written commitment of the individual involved must provide for continuation of employment in order for him to be one above the limit. The people who are identified among the limit are the same ones who can recruit. You can't have a certain limit to recruit and others to coach. They must be one and the same.

Eugene Corrigan (University of Virginia): Warren, if a university has a new coaching staff this year and they hire a head coach and eight assistants, which is what we are moving toward, and this passes, may we have an additional eight assistants until 1979?

Mr. Brown: The basic rule provides that effective August 1, 1976, commitments that are written in effect at that time are the only ones that count for purposes of your being above the limit. So anything you do thereafter, with some new person, is not included and may not be considered for the purpose of being above the limit.

Mr. Corrigan: So eight would be the limit regardless of what year this is extended to?

Mr. Brown: That is correct. These amendments deal with the definition of normal attrition only. It tells you what is normal attrition. It doesn't treat what is a written commitment.

Stanley McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): A point of clarification. If No. 135 passed, the final adjustment must be achieved by August 1, 1979. My question is, if No. 135 does not pass, what is the date when the final adjustment must be achieved?

Mr. Brown: There would not be any specific date which you must be down to the limit. If you have people above the limit who have formal written security agreements or contracts, or tenure, there would not be any date that is magic, so to speak, that it would go into effect.

Mr. McCaffrey: This does set a final adjustment date, whereas, if it is not passed, there is no final adjustment date set.

Jack McClelland (Big Eight Conference): Nos. 136 and 137 also affect the final date. It might be more valid to the organization if there is need for a change, for the adoption of those and not No.

135. There is also no way to designate coaches out of 15 and, say, which ones will recruit. Our offensive line coach and your back-side-tackle coach are both coaches, but the back-side-tackle coach doesn't come to the meetings and doesn't show up on the campus except on Saturday night.

President Fuzak: May I have your attention? I would like to point out if No. 135 passes, since it is the greatest modification, Nos. 136 and 137 become moot. That is the way we have operated, the greatest degree of modification.

[Proposal No. 135 (page A-58) was defeated by Division I.]

Coaching Staffs

Milton Hartvigsen (Brigham Young University): I move the adoption of No. 136 for the modification of this rule.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the reasons are obvious. It gives the non-tenured, single-year-contract coach an opportunity to make adjustments more equitable with those of tenure or longer term contracts.

President Fuzak: It delays the effective date to August 1, 1978.

Mr. Broyles: I am trying to just bring to the attention of everybody the inequities that exist here for a school that already has the limit or a new coach going into a situation can only have eight coaches, and the other who have 15 have two additional years.

The coaches that have eight don't like to be there when the two years are over, they are out of a job. You can't compete eight against 15, or eight against 12. In my area of the country, the recruiting and so forth is approximately \$65,000, which would be a savings. Are we serious about cutting back or not?

[Proposal No. 136 (page A-58) was defeated by Division I.]

Coaching Staffs

Louis McCullough (Iowa State University): I move Proposal No. 137 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to delay the effective date for limitations on coaching staffs by one year. Chuck Neinas has talked about this, but I think it is imperative we do give these coaches at least one more year for adjustments. I know that there are many of you who have eight coaches, some have six, some have three; but if you have been over to the lobby of the football convention and you have seen the hundreds of young men that are standing around that don't have a job, don't know where their families are going to be, and the people that have dedicated their lives to the football profession, I think the least we can do for these men is to give them one more grace period so that they can get their profession and lives in order.

I hate to lose some to other professions. Give them one year. If you give them one year, I am certain they can adjust. I hope you will take this into consideration.

[Proposal No. 137 (page A-58) was defeated by Division I, 81-93.]

Squad Limitations

John Toner (University of Connecticut): In behalf of the ECAC, I move adoption of No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

Many of our schools in the ECAC have found that a number of restrictions do not save money. In addition, they want the freedom to field home teams in unlimited quantities and the freedom to use their means of transportation to take more players to away games than the current restrictions allow.

Joe Vancisin (National Association of Basketball Coaches): We also support this proposal. Existing legislation on squad limitations has really had a demoralizing effect on our basketball squads, and our organization feels the proposal will relieve this condition.

Francis Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to speak in behalf of this motion. Our experience over the past four months has indicated that in the East, in particular, the savings have not existed in terms of economy. What we have learned here in this Convention is that the institutions have been saying that the best person to handle issues of economy is the individual institution, and that broad national programs in areas that have different problems of divergent needs do not satisfy the economy in each institution. I ask, therefore, that this Convention support No. 138.

Fred Miller (Arizona State University): The Western Athletic Association supports No. 138 as well as Nos. 139 and 140. We feel that is the better way to handle it at the institutions.

[Proposal No. 138 (page A-59) was approved by Divisions II and III and defeated by Division I, 90-124; motion to reconsider in Division I was defeated, 93-115.]

President Fuzak: For Divisions II and III, the next consideration will be No. 176. For Division I, we will proceed now to No. 139.

Squad Limitations

Mr. Miller (Arizona State University): I move adoption of No. 139.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would support the adoption of this. We feel there are no cost savings as has been determined on the size of the whole squad. The Western Athletic Conference, we allow the declaration of the home squad to compete in these sports and feel the declaration is important. The institution can most profitably run its business in this area. I am embarrassed if I have to eliminate home squads, that I think that is obvious to what we intend to do in the area of athletics.

Jack Doland (McNeese State University): I am in favor of No. 139, except No. 149 takes care of track particularly, which has a big advantage. I don't know anything about ice hockey, but it does take care of ice hockey. I suppose that is an advantage. If it is opened up for all sports, it might be a disadvantage and a problem in the sport of track and field. I think No. 149 would be a better situation.

Mr. Miller: To respond to that, all the conference has to do is to declare the number of competitors. You can run 50 kids if you have 28 as the traveling squad.

[Proposal No. 139 (page A-59) was approved by Division I, 109-98.]

Squad Limitations

Earl Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I move adoption of Proposal No. 140.

[The motion was seconded.]

Harry Cross (University of Washington): I think we ought to have limits, but I think it is ridiculous to have limits on one side and not on the other. I think we ought to eliminate the limits and support this, too.

Sam Bell (United States Track Coaches Association): We, as an Association, are terrifically concerned about the limitations imposed on track and field. Our track and field meets have anywhere from 16 to 21 events. With current limitations, it is impossible to field a team and have people in each event.

It is a very unfair item to let a whole team have unlimited participation. For example, the present limitation of indoor track is 22 for a traveling squad and for outdoor track, 27. When you start figuring there are three places per event in a track meet that score, then you start thinking about the dual competition, there will be lots of dual meets in this country that one team will be able to put contestants in, and the visiting team will not have a contestant, and the competition will become a farce. I certainly urge the passage of No. 140 for the equality of competition in this country in the sport of track and field.

Charley Scott (University of Alabama): As has been indicated earlier in one of the previous amendments that we were considering, there is little economy to be gained in this matter. It seems that only the cost of the room in which those players, particular players, might stay is saved. One example of the school in our particular conference, \$162 was saved from the players cost to a game attended by 70,000 people. That school spent more on the administration of the ticket amendment than it saved.

John Caine (San Jose State University): I would like to support the representative from the Track Coaches Association relative to the support of track. I would like to speak for all sports in this regard. There is absolutely no equity whatsoever in having a home team being able to compete with innumerable competitors and the visiting team be restricted. For example, we have a good track team and we go down every year to compete against UCLA. We have enough trouble with them without having disparity in the number of competitors we have.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Is it possible, if we vote limits on the traveling squad, to come back and reconsider the limits on the home squad? Can we ask for reconsideration after the limits are passed so that we can come out with limits on both traveling and dress-out squads at home?

President Fuzak: There is no assurance that a reconsideration motion will pass, but it is in order.

Mr. Broyles: I want to alert the Convention that we will ask for reconsideration on the dress-out squad at home after we try to balance it out even, whatever the point is.

[Proposal No. 140 (page A-59) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Cross: My remarks a moment ago about wanting to have limits still stands, but when a proposition is in economy, certainly of those who were in conferences, are able to achieve the economy. Many of us will take care of most of our situations. The problem we have here now, we have no control as to our present position in non-conference competition. We have not abandoned economy, but we have indented it a little bit.

Recruiting Benefits

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): I move consideration of Proposal No. 176 and its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

The objective of this proposal is to clarify some provisions which presently exist and specifically to exclude from the recruitment the prospect of jobs for the prospective student-athlete's relatives. It also provides for his acceptance of employment as a prospective student-athlete and loans from a regular lending agency. As you will note, this is endorsed by the Committee on Infractions, and I think the intention of the legislation is good to state clearly for recruiting those things which would place them in violation.

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): As I recall, this Convention looked at similar legislation perhaps a year ago and found that that legislation was perhaps too binding. I don't recall the action we took at that time. My impression of this legislation is that this clarifies the issues that were raised last time to the point where this ought to be rather clear that this deals with unethical practices in recruiting. If we are interested in fair and ethical practices in recruiting and wish to avoid making undue inducements to a prospective student's relatives, then we ought to pass this. I speak strongly in favor of passing this as a means of achieving better recruiting.

President Fuzak: The question has been called for. I would like to point out that this is the rationale, this must be passed by the entire body, a majority of the entire body, since it doesn't make sense for one division to have a different interpretation of the same Bylaw. In other words, the Bylaw is common in all three divisions, and all three must have the same interpretation of it.

[Proposal No. 176 (page A-72) was approved by all three divisions.]

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): Before we move into the series of legislative proposals on recruiting contacts, I should like to ask reconsideration of Item No. 116.

[The motion was seconded.]

The concept of limitations on athletic grants, a combination of initial grants in overall limits results not only in an economic savings, but also provides for placing a premium on the athlete who can make it academically as well as athletically. The limitation of initial grants in this situation would provide for another situation where an institution might eliminate its academic risk and athletic risk on a wholesale basis. Also inherent in this legislation, which I think was adopted in an ill advised manner yesterday, is the possibility of a similar move to establish the same kind of situation in football. For that reason, I urge reconsideration of this proposal.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): We strongly support it for the same reasons just mentioned.

David Strack (University of Arizona): I strongly urge that the vote which was taken yesterday be maintained and the reconsideration move be defeated.

John Hook (Pan American University): I urge that we repeal the six initial awards limitation. That is too confining and not realistic to maintain in basketball.

[The motion to reconsider No. 116 (page A-50) was defeated by Division I, 90-115.]

Recruiting Contacts

Bill Putnam (University of South Carolina): I move adoption of proposal No. 177.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is clear, and I will not comment further.

Mr. Broyles: I would like to speak against this. In recruiting in our part of the country, we felt like we have an advantage by seeing a prospect every day and would see the good prospects 40 or 50 times early in the football season until recruiting time. This forced everybody else to see him 50 times, and we weren't gaining any advantage. The advantage in this is if you only can see him three times and the other schools can only see him three times, you still are on equal footing. Technically, in the cost factor, we think it saves a tremendous amount of money.

Mr. Doland: Darrell Royal, president of the American Football Coaches Association, made a fine speech about the fact that it is hard to make illegal offers until you get well acquainted with the student-athlete. I think that this particular legislation will hold back that acquaintance; and a student-athlete will go to the normal school he would naturally go to, instead of to some high-powered, super salesman with a few illegal things hanging around.

[Proposal No. 177 (page A-73) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting Contacts

Wade Walker (University of Oklahoma): There is an editorial change. After the words "exempt as," then the wording, "one of the off-campus contact." With that editorial change, I move that No. 178 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

We are now locked in with three contacts with a prospective athlete unless he comes to the campus at his own volition and own expense. Unlike Arkansas, we are not densely populated, apparently; and the youngster does not have an opportunity to visit our campus. We again would like to have the opportunity in contacting the youngster to have him come to our campus for a visit and we would like to go back to his parents and to that youngster and explain all the ramifications of recruiting.

President Fuzak: I would like to point out that No. 178-1 is an amendment to the amendment, which is the editorial correction which was indicated. Unless someone challenges it, we will accept it as an editorial modification rather than voting upon 178-1.

[Proposal No. 178-1 (page A-133) was accepted by Divisions I and II.]

Mr. Broyles: I am asking for clarification. That means if you use three visits on the boy, you could go back with a letter of intent one time to try to sign him, is that correct? Wade, is that the interpretation? He could go back one time with the letter of intent?

Mr. Walker: Yes.

Daniel Miller (Indiana University): I think that is a key point. It

doesn't say that. If a person has a letter in his pocket, he can go back 50 times the way it reads, I believe.

John Toner (University of Connecticut): I have a question. If a letter of intent or a conference letter of intent is not part of the NCAA Constitution and Bylaw structure, is this particular amendment in order?

President Fuzak: This is an official interpretation of what is legislation in the Association. We do have recruiting rules. Of course, it relates to something.

Mr. Toner: The reason for my question is all the membership has the privilege of letters of intent and not all conferences do. Somehow, could that be relevant to this particular problem?

President Fuzak: I am sorry. You had the option of having one, and it also says institutional. So, I would think that you are speaking in opposition to the proposal, rather than questioning its legality.

Mr. Toner: Well, that makes a good point, too.

Mr. Duke: I would like to underscore the point that Professor Miller of Indiana made a moment ago in a different light. There are many different signing dates for conference letters of intent. For example, the Southeastern Conference traditionally has signed letters of intent in December. The Big Eight and the Southwest Conference have done it in February. The Big Ten Conference has done it on a later date. As Dan Miller pointed out, any time a recruiter had a letter in his pocket, the Southeastern Conference recruiter, for example, could visit a prospect any number of times after that December date, and for that reason, I think this proposal should be voted down.

Charles Neinas (Big Eight Conference): In response to my esteemed colleague from the Big Ten, the reason that the language was changed under No. 178-1 is to clarify you have one opportunity to contact an individual relative to signing a letter of intent in addition to the three permissible contacts for recruiting purposes.

Thomas Jacobs (UCLA): The gentleman has said this would confine you just to one visit. It has been pointed out several times if you go to signing with a letter of intent in your pocket, that would make it so you could go as many times as you wanted to. The language of the editorial change is faulty. You will have to do it over again at another Convention.

[Proposal No. 178 (page A-73) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting Contacts

Lavon McDonald (University of New Mexico): I move adoption of Proposal No. 179.

[The motion was seconded.]

This, in essence, accomplishes, I think, much of what the preceding one wanted to do; and it is much clearer and allows two more visits which would not count in the signing of the conference or national letter of intent. It simply states that we are going to have five instead of three, and I think it would be much cleaner language. We propose that the Convention adopt this proposal.

[Proposal No. 179 (page A-73) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting Contacts

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan): I move the adoption of No. 180.

[The motion was seconded.]

I placed this before the Convention at the direction of the Board of Control of Intercollegiate Athletics of the University of Michigan. That is the body through which the faculty exercises its control over athletics there. About two years ago, the Board created a special subcommittee to investigate and consider the recruiting situation which was publicized as getting out of hand, and in that connection for a period of about a year and one-half consulted many people, including coaches, commissioners, faculty members, alumni, students, it took a long, deliberate look at the recruiting situation.

One of the recommendations made by that committee is embodied in the proposed measure, and it is that the head football coach and the head basketball coach be precluded from recruiting off-campus. Now, there was, interestingly enough, these recommendations came from the head coaches themselves.

The head coaches are subject, at least in these two sports, to a great many pressures. They are out on the mashed potato circuit a great deal through the year. The alumni clubs like to have them make speeches. If you add the recruiting pressures, all of them say they don't like it; and indeed, some very fine coaches have left coaching because of this obligation.

There are plenty of assistant coaches who become acquainted with the family and become acquainted with the environment in which the high school student-prospect developed; and the need of the head coach's visit is minimal, except in one situation.

Both of our head coaches and the three others in our conference have told me they face this. Alumnus will call them about a prospect in which they have an interest and will say coach so and so was here, naming the head coach of some competing institution, and he talked to the young man and you better get down here and talk to him, too; or he will think we are not interested.

Time and again the programs of these head coaches have to be interrupted so that he can make what he deems to be an emergency business at this time. John Pont, if he had not left the Convention, was going to reaffirm the desirability of this amendment. I don't know whether there is economy involved, but for humanitarian reasons, I urge the Convention to adopt No. 180.

Mr. Broyles: As a head coach, I should like to stay at home with my family, but my family is almost grown, so I can leave. I really would urge the Convention to vote against this. Some schools only have one basketball coach and that would be the head coach. As the head football coach, I feel it is my responsibility to be in the home, since the parents are very unlikely to visit the campus and assistant coaches change from time to time. In other words, I think most assistant coaching staffs vary from time to time, and maybe some head coaches also; but I feel that it is my responsibility when I go into the home as the head coach, which I try to do with every player I think I have a chance to get. I think the head coach is the one who should talk to the family and assure the family of his program, and so forth. I urge all to turn this down.

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): Division II institutions, I ask you to vote it down. It is impractical and illogical for our smaller staffs.

[Proposal No. 180 (page A-74) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting Contacts

William Orwig (Indiana University): On behalf of the Council, I move No. 181. It seems to me that this is just a routine matter. The purpose of this particular amendment is to close a loophole which we didn't get closed at the Special Convention last summer.

It refers to the three contact rule; and the way it stands now, unless this is adopted, recruiters could contact the families and the relatives in their towns instead of the boy. Thus, they could really have more than the three contacts, not necessarily with the boy, but with his parents. I think it would also enforce the cost savings measure which we hope to provide in the three limit visitation. It seems to me this is the right thing to do, and I urge the Convention to adopt this amendment.

Charley Scott (University of Alabama): I believe that the term "relative" needs to be defined. I think a genealogist would agree we have many relatives in our history.

President Fuzak: I would like to point out if this passes, No. 182 will become moot.

[Proposal No. 181 (page A-74) was approved by Division I and II.]

Recruiting Contacts

Cecil Coleman (University of Illinois): I move No. 183 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

This does basically the same thing as we were not able to do in August. It relates to No. 181, just including coaches along with it.

[Proposal No. 183 (page A-75) was approved by Division I, 103-95; defeated by Division II, 46-48.]

Richard Post (San Jose State College): I would like an interpretation from someone regarding the words with respect to No. 183. What is meant by "all contacts?" Does that mean that the coaches may not telephone or write any other coach during that period?

President Fuzak: I suppose it is proper to ask the question. I wish you would have asked it before we voted.

Mr. Post: Then, I would like to ask for reconsideration.

President Fuzak: Let's see if we can handle that by trying to answer your question.

Mr. Coleman: I hesitate to say anything. I see Warren Brown headed up there. The indication we would give is that all contact would only have to do with eyeball to eyeball and would not have anything to do with letters or telephone as has ordinarily been the case. Actually, the thing we have just passed, what it does, it does the same thing we discussed on the floor of the Convention in August. It eliminates that junior recruiting.

Al Paul (Columbia University): Does this mean, then, at clinic we cannot look eyeball to eyeball with the high school coaches who may be there during the period? That is personal contact.

Warren Brown (NCAA Staff): The basic rule that amends speaks

only to off-campus in-person contact and it, therefore, cannot be considered to be all contacts.

Mr. Post: I would like to call for reconsideration, I think, in terms of the interpretation. A clinic is off campus.

President Fuzak: Remember, these are two divisions. The question is, shall we reconsider the adoption of No. 183? You are speaking now on the motion whether we shall reconsider or not.

Mr. Coleman: The only clarification I want to make, this section only deals with recruiting.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): That was my thinking, that this contact interpretation is for purpose of recruitment.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I am curious. If your son is a basketball player and you are the head coach and he is in high school, does he have to move out of the house for that period? I mean, this is the type of legislation that I think gets a little ludicrous and is impossible to enforce.

President Fuzak: You are speaking, I presume, President Horn, to have reconsideration?

Mr. Horn: Yes.

[The motion to reconsider was approved, and Proposal No. 183 (page A-75) then was defeated by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 184 (page A-75) was withdrawn.]

Recruiting Contacts

David Maggard (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the Pacific-8 Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 185.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 185 is to include relatives and legal guardians of prospective student-athletes in the restrictions on recruiting contacts and to eliminate the "seasonal" restrictions on recruiting; to permit such contacts during the summer immediately preceding the prospect's senior year in high school. I urge adoption of this.

President Fuzak: This will be in two parts, "seasonal" restrictions and permit recruiting in the summer after the junior year.

Andy Geiger (University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Ivy Group, I want to indicate that we prefer No. 185 over No. 186, which is our amendment. We support No. 185 for the reasons given by Mr. Maggard.

Jack Doland (McNeese University): Just as a point of clarification, can you advise me exactly what is meant by the June 15 deadline?

Joseph Ruetz (Sanford University): I rise to speak in favor of this motion for several reasons. It appears to me that the recruiting restrictions that were imposed last year were done basically because of the particular problem in a particular area of the country. When you look at recruiting in non-income-producing sports—and I am thinking of swimming as one example—our swimming coach does not go off campus to make personal visits with student-athletes. What he does is go to a summer program where all the major swimmers in the country are gathered for the competition and has an area to talk to a number of student-athletes at that particular time about the admissions. There is an elaborate admissions at Stan-

ford. That is the only off-campus contact this man has.

The restrictions at the present time are so limiting from that point of view, it will cost us money. It is already doing that in baseball which goes through a similar process.

President Fuzak: I think in answer to the previous question, I will attempt it. If I am incorrect, the Pac-8 can correct me. It puts an end or eliminates the period and just puts all sports June 15 as the last date.

Mr. Doland: The first date would remain the same, but immediately after the high school senior graduation or the junior year, or exactly when did it begin under the legislation? We had a beginning date in football and the ending date is fine. The beginning date would cost a lot of money in that you would be recruiting all year long in the sport of football beginning in June, July and August, which we have not been doing.

Jack Larsen (University of Southern California): Paragraph 2 points out the beginning of recruiting. There is no recruiting permitted until the prospective student-athlete has completed his junior year in high school, whatever date that might be.

Robert Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): In withdrawing No. 184, the ECAC strongly supports No. 185. I ask that the question be voted upon at this particular time.

Mr. Paul: Just to reiterate the fact that we put all this into effect based on economy, and we have the three-visit rule. We limit ourselves to three visits. What difference does it make when you make those three visits? The time is not the money saving factor. It is the number of times. We all control our recruiting budgets. Let our men go, but limit them to go only three times.

Mr. Post: There is nothing said in this motion regarding junior colleges. If you read the interpretation, it says the final date for contacts in all sports shall be June 15 and the senior year of high school. How do you contact a junior college athlete?

I would like also to ask for reiteration on what the previous speakers have said. If you have it limited to three contacts, what difference does it make when those three contacts are? What about the junior college? Can I get an answer from the Pac-8 Conference?

Mr. Ruetz: As drawn, it speaks only to the high school, not the junior college at all.

William Wall (Amateur Basketball Association of the U. S. A.): The National Association of Basketball Coaches has conducted extensive research in this area. We have interviewed over 400 prospective coaches and parents, and the conclusions that we came to were that they did not want to have any official contacts during their particular season. They recommend that the college and universities do their recruiting in the summer months in a more relaxed atmosphere when the pressures of the young man in his particular season academically and athletically are not as great.

Mickey Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): I would like to ask a follow-up question on the junior college point. If this applies only to the high school situation, a senior in high school, then what are the restrictions, if any, upon the recruitment of the junior college prospect, other than three contacts?

Mr. Larsen: Warren Brown reminded me there has been an in-

terpretation issued that if a student-athlete has gone through the three opportunities recruiting process in high school and attends junior college, he is available for three more visits.

President Fuzak: Otherwise, there is no "seasonal" limitation?

Mr. Holmes: Then, it would be open season the year round on the junior college prospect, other than the three contact restrictions?

Mr. Larsen: That is correct. The interpretation, which has been issued, applies this rule written for high school student-athletes to the junior college student-athletes.

[Proposal No. 185 (page A-76) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

President Fuzak: No. 186 now is moot. No. 187 also is moot. That paragraph was taken out, so No. 187 is moot. No. 188, that is moot, too, because paragraphs 4 and 5 have been taken out. No. 189 is likewise moot. This is the most rapid progress we have made in two days. [Laughter] No. 190 is appropriate.

Recruiting Contacts

Joe Vancisin (National Association of Basketball Coaches): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 190.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is submitted by the National Association of Basketball Coaches. We found the greatest objection from the parents and the boys came when we contacted them during the season. This would allow for contact in the summer months but would restrict contacts from October 15 to April 1 which is the very season in which these young men are competing. The coaches can evaluate their abilities in person in attendance at the basketball games. I think this would be a fine move to help take pressures off these young men, particularly during the season.

We have done a lot of study and given this a lot of thought and our coaches have come up with this recruiting calendar which this proposal advocates. We solicit the support of this body. One of the good features of this is we feel that the coaches should devote more time to the men that are on campus playing for them, and I think this proposal will support that.

Mr. Broyles: A point of clarification. Does anyone think that this is going to cut down costs because the basketball coaches are going to be out scouting for investigative reasons during the entire year now? They can't make contact during this period. But, my basketball coach has two assistants and a graduate assistant, who can't recruit; but the two assistants are going to be evaluating and seeing the high school games and spending just as much money.

Mr. Holmes: As I read this, if this were to pass, it would allow basketball four in person contacts, while all other contacts would remain three. Is that correct?

President Fuzak: Yes, that is correct.

[Proposal No. 190 (page A-79) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

J. T. King (Texas Tech University): Could I ask for reconsideration of Proposal No. 137? The reasons for it is to give the universities more time to get their house in order on coaching staffs. I move that we reconsider No. 137.

[The motion was seconded.]

This will give us at least one more year to get our houses in order. We have commitments that we feel very strongly about and we would like the indulgence of this group to reconsider.

Mr. Doland: As a university not involved with too many numbers, I feel that this would be good for the Association. Since many of the Southeast, Big Eight, and other conferences have too many coaches and did not know this rule would be passed August 15, 1975, I feel it would be a good thing to rescind it. Another year would be a big help to the assistant coaches now looking for coaching jobs.

[Motion to reconsider No. 137 (page A-58) was defeated by Division I.]

Recruiting Contacts—Scouting

Mr. Broyles: I move that No. 191 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe in this legislation the Convention should pay attention that we are now cutting costs drastically if we can pass this rule for this reason. In the major football schools or the schools that have large staffs, as soon as our spring training is over, we join the other staffs on an investigative recruiting procedure for the next six or eight weeks, months and sometimes all during the summer.

This legislation would prevent investigative recruiting or scouting of the prospects and the time is not necessary, in the opinion of some, that is in the spring and summer. It still leaves you plenty of time beginning August 14 to do your investigative recruiting. Therefore, this legislation would prohibit your coaches from leaving the campus and doing investigative recruiting during these months.

Sam Bailey (University of Alabama): I have listened to Coach Broyles. I think he is a little suspicious in many of his ideas. In many parts of the country, especially in the Southeast, we have spring practice for high school athletes. In our particular conference, we sign in December. Our evaluation of an athlete is made in the previous spring. We have limited the visits to three, and I think we have enough limits on recruiting as it is.

[Proposal No. 191 (page A-79) was defeated by all three divisions.]

Recruiting Contacts—Service Academies

Edwin Saxer (University of Toledo): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of No. 192.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council asks that you confirm an action taken by the Council with respect to the recruiting program at the service academies. In the normal course of events, at the direction of Congress, the service academies make initial contact with respective midshipmen and cadets in the junior year. There is no increase in the number of visits. It is just permission to make the initial contacts in the junior year. I am sure that the Council and the service academies would appreciate the approval of this Proposal.

[Proposal No. 192 (page A-79) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting—Publicity

Ernest Casale (Temple University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of No. 193.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to clarify what can be done in the normal announcement in regard to signing prospective athletes, particularly with regard to the student-athlete's community.

[Proposal No. 193 (page A-80) was approved by all three divisions.]

Campus Visitations Limitation

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth University): On behalf of the Ivy Group, I move Proposal No. 194.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will define and establish a paid visit only when traveling expenses are provided and would count and limit only those paid visits. It would provide travel expenses which are the major cause to campus visitations by prospective student-athletes. All those institutions that don't want to count the student-athlete who comes to the institution and has a sandwich and a cup of coffee, or just a cup of coffee, should vote for the Proposal No. 194.

[Proposal No. 194 (page A-80) was defeated by Division I.]

President Fuzak: At this time, I am going to call on our parliamentarian to make a suggestion on how we might deal expeditiously with these series of proposals beginning with No. 195.

Alan Chapman (Rice University): The grouping Nos. 195 through 205 refers to campus visitations limitation. Some deal with one sport, some with several sports and some with a few sports. I might mention that it is my understanding that No. 199 is to be withdrawn.

What I would propose is a variance on a provision which is possible under Robert's Rules of Order called filling the blanks. If we can get one proposition that mentions all the numbers, say, like No. 197, before us, that has numbers in all the sports and in the total, and then the chair can declare all those numbers blank. Then, according to the procedure, one may regard all the other proposals as suggestions for filling the blanks which will be considered and need not be seconded. The current numbers are also considered as proposals for filling in the blanks.

We can proceed in the following grouping, as I see it, and try to give a fair treatment for every suggestion and every sport in the order of increasing a modification, and stopping when you get to a point. I would propose taking, for instance, the sport of football, which is now 75, and consider the limit of 100 as proposed in Proposal No. 200, then consider the limit of 95 as proposed in No. 196, and stop whenever you get a majority.

If you don't get any majority, then revert to the current number 75. We then would look at basketball and the current limit is now 12, and consider, first the number suggested in No. 202, which is 30 in two years and 18 in one year, and consider the numbers proposed in Nos. 196 and 201, namely, 18, and then consider the number proposed in 203, namely, 15. You would consider them in that order and stop when you get a majority. Then you could take all the other sports as one chunk. You would first look at No. 195, which I think eliminates all sports. But if that doesn't pass, then go on and then imagine the numbers in No. 196 to be before us and look, first, at No. 204, which changes gymnastics to seven.

Then, No. 205 changes hockey to 18. If those don't pass, revert

back to No. 196 and then again stop. Then, finally, look at the numbers which deal with the total in other sports which is currently 53. Consider, first, No. 195 or 196, which makes it zero, and then No. 197, which makes it 90, and then No. 198, which makes it 75. This way I think every number gets fairly considered until a greater modification gets adopted, and get all the sports in the most expeditious manner.

President Fuzak: The chair will rule this is an appropriate procedure, if the parliamentarian can keep me straight. Is there any objection to this proceeding? I don't think a motion is necessary, unless you wish to formalize the ruling. We will just proceed. Will someone move Proposition No. 197, and then I declare everything blank after that.

[See action line for Proposal No. 195 (page A-81) for the results of the filling the blanks process.]

Cecil Coleman (University of Illinois): I so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Fuzak: It has been moved and seconded. I declare all those numbers blank, and we can proceed. This is for Division I only, and football will be the one before us currently. No. 200 changes the limit from 75 to 100 in football. That is for Division I. Does anybody want to speak on that?

Fred Miller (Arizona State University): We found especially in areas that are not metropolitan areas that our success ratio with the 75 is not doing the job. We are asking for those areas, those schools in the metropolitan areas, to consider this. I know in our particular university, should we have less than our 30 initial grants, our program is impaired. That deters our entire program. We think it is sound and request the Convention to support the 100 visitations.

President Fuzak: I might add, this is Division I football.

Ed Crowder (University of Colorado): I reaffirm what Fred has said. We have found up to this point, just by scheduling prospects ahead, there is a very high likelihood that we will pass the 75 mark, reach the 75 mark, without having achieved the time to bring them in. I think the schools that are in more populated areas than we aren't as affected as much as us.

[Division I football defeated 100 visits, 61-76.]

President Fuzak: We now move to 95, which is suggested in Proposal No. 196.

Andy Geiger (University of Pennsylvania): I would like to add one more voice to the two that you have heard, Fred Miller and Ed Crowder, that this is very important to us. We urge adoption of 95 visits.

Mr. Crowder: I would like to say one more word on this. I have a little difficulty in understanding the negative votes. If you don't want to invite them to your campus, to 75, that is fine. There are many of us can't possibly do the job that we are trying to do which we must do to succeed in athletics with 75. I feel that most of you who have a sense of understanding of recruiting can cast a positive rather than a negative vote. This is a must for institutions that just cannot accomplish the task with 75.

Mr. Miller: I concur. I am surprised we have this kind of vote. Sometimes we ask for a conscience vote and this situation is impor-

tant, extremely important to major football playing schools. If it doesn't affect your program, then I am requesting let your conscience dictate your vote.

[Division I football approved 95 visits.]

President Fuzak: We will now go to basketball. In basketball, the current limit is 12. The proposition is No. 202, suggests 30 in two years and a maximum of 18 in one year. I am sorry. It should be No. 201, which makes it 18 in each year, and I guess that is larger than the other one. So, in basketball, the number 18 in each year as proposed in No. 201 for Division I.

Mr. Miller: We would like to have No. 201.

[Division I basketball approved 18 visits, 112-96.]

President Fuzak: We are now dealing with all other sports. As we look at No. 195, which eliminates in all sports, is the greatest modification.

J. B. Halstead (University of Iowa): The intent of this amendment is to eliminate campus visitations in all sports except football and basketball, as you have explained. The amendment is similar in concept to No. 187, in that it represents a compromise, allowing for institutional discretion by the budget mechanism to control campus visitations in all sports except football, which has been established at 95, and basketball at 18. It provides a mechanism, the development of a reasonable control through the administrative budgetary mechanism.

President Fuzak: We are not looking at the total, we are looking at the individual sport. We will go through the individual sports, because that is the way we have to proceed in this process. We will come back and catch that total later.

Mr. Geiger: Isn't the question before the house the entire No. 195 with the adjusted football and basketball numbers?

President Fuzak: No. In this process where we are filling the blanks, we have to go sport by sport. We are trying to take them all at once, so we go right down. If you look at the total package, it seems to be the best way to proceed.

Mr. Halstead: A point of order. This would be unnecessary if No. 195 passes, is that not correct?

President Fuzak: If you eliminate all of them, that is limitations in all those sports other than football and basketball, I guess it could be done in one swoop. I misunderstood what you are telling me, Alan. That is possible, if No. 195 is approved.

[Division I approved the elimination of limitations on visits in all sports except football and basketball.]

Now, the appropriate procedure, this is a learning experience for me, we have no formal list, adopt the whole measure, that is, No. 195 with the 95 in football and 18 in basketball.

[Proposal No. 195 (page A-81) was moved, seconded and approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 206 (page A-85) was withdrawn.]

Campus Visitation

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): I move the adoption of Item No. 207.

[The motion was seconded.]

There is in effect a proposal regarding transportation of the pros-

pect to the campus. Many of our states have regulations that require institutions to adhere to the tourist class fare. We just feel this is a good economy move.

[Proposal No. 207 (page A-85) was approved by all three divisions.]

Campus Visitation

Cecil Coleman (University of Illinois): I move adoption of No. 209.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reasons for this are two. First of all, the limitations that the institution has on the number of paid visits that you can have come to your campus actually takes care of this problem. Secondly, in the way the rules are, we read them now or interpret them, if a student comes to your campus on the seventh or eighth visit, the violation is against the institution and not against the student.

[Proposal No. 209 (page A-86) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Campus Visitation

Herman Sledzik (Indiana, Pa., University): I am Herman Sledzik representing the Pennsylvania State Colleges Athletic Conference. I move adoption of No. 210.

[The motion was seconded.]

The way the present legislation reads, one meal would constitute a paid visit. The majority of the students at our institution come from a 100- to 150-mile radius, and it's not necessary for us to provide transportation or room expense.

It is necessary on many occasions, though, to provide a meal. In this particular legislation, the way it reads, in football we have 37 lunches that cost us 65 cents apiece, and this amounts to \$31.45. In basketball, it would cost \$9.25 and golf would cost \$1.70. We feel this is unrealistic.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): I would like to speak in opposition to this and call to the membership's attention this would very definitely favor a metropolitan institution and also to the effect these meals don't have to take place on campus.

[Proposal No. 210 (page A-87) was defeated by all three divisions.]

Campus Visitation

Robert Latour (Bucknell University): I propose adoption of Proposal No. 211.

[The motion was seconded.]

To prevent a coach from being a courteous host, so that he might at least be able to entertain a prospective student-athlete in a school cafeteria for one meal, and if he does follow this practice to equate that with air fare to the campus seems to us to be very unfair and really ridiculous.

I know that some in this group say that this type of amendment favors metropolitan institutions. I do not believe this. My institution, Bucknell, is not a metropolitan school. In fact, just 30 seconds in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, would convince you of that. I feel very sincerely that the opportunity for a coach to at least welcome a prospective student-athlete into the school cafeteria for a one meal visit is certainly in order. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 211 (page A-87) was approved by all three divisions.]

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): I call to your attention an inequity in reorganization. Some things do crop up that were never anticipated. We have found that during this Convention the Division I conferences or institutions have submitted legislation. This legislation automatically applies to Division II, so we voted on these things either down or up accordingly. In this case, campus visit limitations, the Council did not see these items before they were submitted because of the November 1 deadline; and as a result, we came to the Convention not knowing that campus limitation could be changed by Division I.

It has changed and as a result there was no limit on campus limitations for all sports other than football and basketball. Because we appear, Division II, in a separate paragraph of this Bylaw, we could not submit an amendment as we came to the Convention. Therefore, I would ask for your unanimous consent of this body so that Division II can vote on the elimination of all campus visitation regulations in sports other than football and basketball. I so move.

President Fuzak: Have you submitted anything in writing, Frank?

Mr. Lindeburg: No.

President Fuzak: I think it is out of order, but I would like to consult with the parliamentarian.

Mr. Lindeburg: No, nothing has been submitted. Several members of Division II were told that they could not submit an amendment because it dealt with a separate paragraph other than the one that was being considered. We realize that there is a difficulty in the fact that other members of Division II, who are not at this Convention, have not been notified of a possibility of changing Division II.

President Fuzak: It is out of order. It is prohibited by all of the provisions that relate to pre-circularization, and we just cannot do that.

Jack Pigot (Mercer University): I have a question about the proposal that was just passed, Proposal No. 211. While I agree with the intent of the proposal 100 per cent, and what they were trying to accomplish, I do have a question.

In the city where Mercer University is located, we produce quite a number of outstanding basketball players every year, either all-state or all-America. I would like to ask about this legislation we just passed. Does it allow us, from the time that a prospect completes his junior year of high school until June 15 of his senior year, if this legislation allows us to provide this prospect with a free meal every day for over a full year without counting that as a campus visitation? If so, I would move for reconsideration.

Eugene Corrigan (University of Virginia): I would like to ask for a point of clarification. As to the complimentary tickets, if a friend would come with him, are they to be fed? If so, I think this is fiscal irresponsibility of the first order. I think we should move for reconsideration. I move for reconsideration of No. 211.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Fuzak: The motion is to reconsider No. 211. That is for all divisions voting.

Victor Buccola (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo): I think he was asking for Division I only.

President Fuzak: This is an official interpretation and it is for all three Divisions, so three divisions have to vote.

Mr. Buccola: It can't be divided?

President Fuzak: The body passed it, so reconsideration is reconsideration by the same body.

John Purry (Brown University): Is it possible to get an answer to the question, the clarification before the reconsideration vote, in terms of whether you can feed someone for that length of time?

Warren Brown (NCAA Staff): This amendment would permit, on an unlimited basis, the provisions of one meal any time the prospect would visit the campus without it counting as a paid visit.

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): I would also like to ask whether or not this means that his athletic friends, on the same team who come with him, may also be fed any time they come with that student-athlete prospect? In other words, I would like to ask if we would be returning to the situation which existed before, a long time ago, when we had almost uncontrolled access to meals by off-campus students, particularly in a metropolitan area.

Mr. Brown: I think the entertainment of the meal is restricted to the prospect. The matter of defining when he brings his friends is another question.

Jack Sawyer (Wake Forest University): If a student visits a campus at his own expense and has lunch and leaves the campus and comes back at suppertime, is this a separate visit? Can we then give him the second meal? What I am getting at, can we give him unlimited board for a full year?

President Fuzak: The answer is yes, if he left the campus and came back.

Mr. Latour: It sometimes gets to be ridiculous the way some of these individual specific cases come up to define the problem. Our intent was not in any way aimed at some of the suggestions. We were considering one meal with a visit to the campus by a student in the cafeteria of that institution. That is all we were thinking about.

Richard Koppenhaver (North Central Conference): I have been sitting here for four days; and I wish we would take the philosophy of finding out how to make some of these rules work, instead of how to get around them.

[The motion for reconsideration was defeated, 182-201.]

Letter of Intent

Charles Samson (Texas A&M University): On behalf of the Southwest Conference, I should like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 212, which is to amend Article 1 of the Bylaws by adding a new Section 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

If I may speak to it briefly, the purpose of this amendment is to establish a letter of intent program that is cast in simple and straightforward language. I would like very briefly to highlight some of the features of this proposal. It includes establishing uniform signing dates for fall, winter and spring sports. All institutions would honor the letter. A prospective student-athlete, who does not meet

the applicable academic requirements, is released from the letter. The student who signs more than one letter of intent or signs a letter of intent but enters another NCAA institution, becomes ineligible for two academic years; and the proposal also specifies certain conditions under which the signing takes place.

Let me conclude by saying that the proposal provides a specific date on or after the prospective athlete may establish his choice of schools, to declare this choice in such a manner as to relieve the pressure related to his continuing recruitment. This would allow the student to concentrate his attentions towards the completion of his high school responsibilities. It is emphasizing, I think, a recruited athlete does not have to declare his choice by any specific time. I urge adoption of this proposal.

Bob Kane (Cornell University): I would like to speak against this motion. I don't believe a national letter of intent can work in such a large and diverse organization. Many of us are against it philosophically, and many would be barred by our own academic interests from taking part.

It is inconsistent with our academic practices. I don't believe the college board schools could meet the deadlines. I would suggest that this is a league or conference, rather than an NCAA matter.

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I have some very brief remarks for Division III, hoping that we will vote against this as a division. The proposal states, "This will enable all NCAA institutions to participate in a national letter of intent with common signing dates." The last sentence in Section 9 says, "... the prospect's decision will be accepted as final by the member institutions of the NCAA." I presume the prospect's decision must be accepted as final by all the member institutions. So, it is voluntary to a point but compulsory once it is used.

Fred Jacoby (Mid-America Conference): I would like to speak in opposition to that one. Although I have great respect for the Southwest Conference because Bill Davis and others were the fathers of the national letter and it has worked pretty well, I think this piece of legislation has holes in it. For example, the letter of intent we used, which is commonly known as the national letter of intent, is not an NCAA instrument. As a result, I don't know how this legislation could come under the NCAA's jurisdiction. On the other hand, if you have a student-athlete who is an excellent track man and just a very, very mediocre wide receiver in football, you could conceivably sign him as a full sport and have him locked in from going into track.

To reiterate, I think it would be injurious to the members of the ECAC, many of whom are not members of the current interconference letter. For example, if a young man signed a basketball letter of intent with Maryland and later decided to go to Navy, Navy would have to abide by that. I think this is very injurious. The strength of the interconference letter, since 1962, has been because it is voluntary. Last year we had over 9,200 signing, and only one came before final jurisdiction. In '74 we had roughly 9,200, and only two. I have great respect for the Southwest Conference. I would urge you to defeat this legislation.

Tom Nyland (LeMoyne College): I would like to speak against

this. The attorneys at our institution feel great doubt of the legal implications, and it would place hardships on the student and the NCAA.

[Proposal No. 212 (page A-88) was defeated by all three divisions.]

Eligibility

Thomas Jacobs (UCLA): I move the adoption of No. 213.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to remove the requirement of a student-athlete's statement, which causes increase in expense rather than a decrease. In our opinion, it does little good.

Don Russell (Wesleyan University): Speaking for the Eastern College Athletic Conference, we wish to support Proposal No. 213. We feel that it is in conflict with the Buckley Amendment to ask a student to sign his rights away under that protection of privacy.

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): On behalf of the Council and as a member of the Eligibility Committee of the NCAA, I really urge you to defeat this proposal. We should retain the student-athlete's statement.

Let me make a few remarks in this regard. I join each one of you in resisting legislation which work to pile up on your desk for controlling legislation by the NCAA. There is no doubt about this. But the form has been shortened; and each time this form is administered by the director of athletics, he will find that the material will come easier to him.

Let's look at the positive side of the legislation as it exists on the books at the present time. This statement is the only vehicle, the only one we have in the NCAA, whereby the student-athlete, and as a consequence the assistant coaches and all the coaches are notified and in the student case, makes the certified compliance concerning eligibility, recruiting, financial aid and amateur status. There was no other way that a student-athlete can become knowledgeable on this. As a consequence, within a period of several years, the word will get back to our prospective student-athletes, and they will come to our institutions and we will visit them and they will be knowledgeable in these areas. As a result, we will end up with fair and ethical practices by our coaches, prospective athletes and the student-athletes. I urge you bear with the administrative burden of this type of legislation. It is good legislation. It is viable.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): I should like to join Frank in his opposition to this legislation. It is apparent to many of us that this is one of the best educational tools we have had down for a long time for our athletes to become aware of the important feature in our legislation. This means, you get before these athletes, and I might add some of our coaches, too, the facts that are important in knowing the legislation that we have and what is against the rules.

Jack Sawyer (Wake Forest College): Speaking as a member of the Infractions Committee, I want to endorse what Frank and Neils have said. We think the educational values are extremely important; but also, this is a tool which is of use to us, particularly in the present day legal situation where it is desirable to have something in writing, a matter of record, perhaps, an assistant coach

who has helped to recruit the student, to certify on the student's form that nothing illegal is done. Already this is found out there is. You have prima facie evidence of illegal activity on the part of the coach, perhaps unethical conduct. We think it is a very valuable tool, particularly valuable with regard to the educational process; and we hope you will defeat this motion.

Stanley McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): I realize people are anxious to vote on this, but I wish to speak against this measure as well. I should like to point out this has been in effect less than one year. You have tried it one time. It seems to me we have changed a lot of things here which we have not really given a chance to work. I am favorably impressed by the argument presented by the three preceding speakers as to the validity and value of this instrument, and I think it would be a serious mistake to withdraw it because the first form was too lengthy. That has been simplified. I think the whole system will be simpler and the values to be obtained should be preserved. I urge you to vote against No. 213.

Bob Reese (Westchester State College): A point of order. On the new short form, where there is a statement about the Buckley Amendment, if the athlete fails to sign and give permission for that information to be released, is he ineligible?

President Fuzak: Yes.

Mr. Reese: Therefore, we are going to make him waive his rights, which is a violation of the Fifth Amendment?

President Fuzak: I don't think it is a violation. We have had some legal advice on this. The question has been called for. The item before us is No. 213. We have to vote on it in sections of A and B. A vote of the total body requiring a two-thirds vote is necessary.

[Proposal No. 213 (page A-88) was defeated.]

[Proposal No. 214 (page A-89) was withdrawn.]

Obligations of Membership—Legal Costs

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan): I move the adoption of Item No. 215.

[The motion was seconded.]

There has been an amendment to this amendment filed. It is 215-1 and I now move the adoption of this amendment to the amendment.

[The motion was seconded.]

The original amendment contains a phrase that some attorneys have found objectionable and unduly vague. Those are the words "directly or indirectly." I can explain now, or wait until a vote on this, as to the implications of this change. It is to make more definite and certain or eliminate some of the looseness in the document. I urge that the words "directly or indirectly" be deleted.

Perhaps I better go into the general character of the amendment and then the significance of the amendment to the amendment. This is the amendment proposed by the Council to require an obligation of membership in an institution having a grievance, exhaust all of the internal procedures of the NCAA before resorting to judicial action or initiating a lawsuit. This has been before the Convention before, but it was given rather brief consideration and merits more consideration than it had last January. One of the points of objection by Council members who have looked at it, is that the penalty

that is imposed—if one may think of it that way, that the institution violating it must pay legal costs of the NCAA—applies for the member of the Association, or any of its members, officers or agents, who directly or indirectly encourages or induces another to bring an action before exhausting the internal procedures. The amendment to the amendment eliminates those words and tightens up the requirement. I would like to discuss the matter further after this amendment is voted upon.

Doug Weaver (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): I rise in opposition to the amendment and the proposal which it amends. Although the striking "directly and indirectly" does tighten up this particular piece of legislation, it is not yet tight enough. The principle exhausting administrative remedies makes sense. At the same time, the phrases when consistent with the results, failure to cooperate fully, really depend on whose ox is getting gored.

Now, we are concerned about the \$300,000 that we spent in legal fees. I think all universities are. This was \$300,000 last year. At the same time, access to the courts will be necessary at some point by many of our members and one of the foundations, if not a right of privilege of the litigants, is to know what the risks and benefits of litigation are.

President Fuzak: You are speaking to the main motion, Doug. We are now considering the amendment to the amendment. I hate to interrupt you.

Mr. Weaver: I had a tremendous finish. [Laughter]

President Fuzak: Knowing you from way back, I know that is true. Doug, I will recognize you first after we have considered the amendment to the amendment.

[Proposal No. 215-1 (page A-134) was approved.]

Mr. Plant: I would now like to address the principal amendment, and I have in mind some of the objections that were raised by the gentleman a moment ago. I realize I have been before this microphone a great deal before this Convention. I am on the verge of wearing out my welcome. Perhaps, I have already done it, but I have been asked by the Council to discuss this.

As the gentleman said, the principle of exhausting internal remedies is a well recognized one. It applies in many voluntary associations. In view of the experiences of the NCAA in the last few years, the necessity of such a provision becomes more and more obvious. Reference has been made to the hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been expended in legal fees, and a good portion of that has been in defense of actions where the administrative remedies have not been exhausted. There is no intent here to limit the right of any member to bring action against the association. It is only intended to require that before starting off, putting the NCAA in the position where they must expend funds, where there may be an adjustment, a compromise or a favorable decision within the interpretal processes of the Association, that the lawsuit be withheld. I doubt if there is very much objection to this principle.

The objections that have been raised have been to the language contained in this proposed amendment. While I must admit that it is not the most artfully drafted piece of legislation that we have ever examined; nonetheless, it seems to me by addressing the ob-

jections and making some legislative history which can be useful in future cases, we could clarify or eliminate the objections.

Now, one of the phrases that has caused concern to lawyers is the one which says that an institution becomes subject to the penalty attached to this violation if it fails to cooperate fully with the Association and the defense of such an action in which the Association is involved. That has been suggested by one counsel's opinion as possibly including the obligation to spend money in the defense, to hire attorneys, to file briefs and so on. That is not the intention of the legislation. Failing to cooperate fully envisions only refusal to give the information, refusal to answer questions, refusing to make the records involved in the case open to the investigators or to the lawyers involved.

With that in the Convention Proceedings, it seems to me that the hazards that this will be loosely applied disappear. Another phrase that has caused difficulty is that "When consistent with the results and upon termination of such legal action, and pursuant to the official procedure." The "when consistent with the results" is, as I understand the Council's interpretation, where the NCAA has defended the action and where it has been brought, either at the instigation or cause of the failure of the institution to cooperate, and has won the action, where the NCAA has won it.

This has happened in a number of cases in which the action was started without exhausting internal procedures. The NCAA has defended it and has had no recourse against the offending institution. There is one other point that should be mentioned, and I am going to give my own view on this. There may be those on the Council who would disagree with that. But the question has been raised whether exhausting the internal procedures requires that the institution involved resort to this Convention, the annual Convention, and put the proposition before it. You will remember Howard University did that a couple of years ago.

It is my own view, in the light of the terminology in our Manual, that is not part of the internal remedial procedures. Where, for example, there has been a decision by the Infractions Committee and the Infractions Committee's decision has been appealed to the Council and the Council has made its determination that the internal procedures have been fully followed. As I say, there may be a difference of opinion on that. But for the purposes of this legislation, it seems to me it would be unreasonable to require that the institution come to the Convention, if it takes place in February and the next Convention is in the following January, for a full year, the Infractions Committee penalty would be in effect.

I think any court would hold that was an internal procedure which would not be satisfactory, one that would define process of law requirements. There is also that a decision might be made by the Infractions Committee, and it would be two or three months before the Council met to review it. There, again, it is quite possible for the interested party to request a telephone conference call or a special meeting of the Council, if the matter is that important, and have a prompt determination. I think the fears that have been raised by the somewhat inept language that might be identified, in light of what I have said, unless the Council or someone at the

Convention disagrees or reverses it, it eliminates the hazards that are connected with this language.

Therefore, on behalf of the Council and for the protection of the Association, for the conservation of funds, I urge that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. Weaver: I think we would all agree the start of the paragraph talks about the exhaustion of administrative remedies, is an important part of the future of this Convention, whether it be a day or next Convention; but as Dr. Plant has stipulated, the fact that this is inept language, it is vague and it is loose. Dr. Plant discussed the intent and the potential way that it would be administered, but this is why it is vague. The problem with vagueness is that potential litigants have no idea what the risks are of a potential lawsuit with the NCAA. This is the bottom of any litigant's privilege, is to know what the risks are. We don't know the risk of this language. We should send it back and draft something and not put more inept language in our Constitution.

Warren Schmakel (Illinois State University): I am not a lawyer and do not profess to be one, but I rise also to speak in opposition to this because of the vagueness I see in the language. I realize that an institution does have responsibilities. They should become involved with those people who might want to take suit against the NCAA, and they should exhaust all procedures.

However, we as a body can enact all the legislation that comes up here. Today and in future NCAA Conventions we, as a body, will be enacting new legislative proposals to many items; and one of the most controversial ones will be Title IX which may or may not be discriminatory in action.

Some students or some parents may become involved with you as the director of athletics, asking what they can do relative to any relief from legislation that we enact. You can go through this complete No. 215 and tell them that. If they still decide and make a court case out of it, I don't know whether your institution would be totally protected from this as written. Gentlemen, I urge that you unanimously vote against No. 215.

Stanley Marshall (NCAA Secretary-Treasurer, South Dakota State University): I strongly urge the membership to support this proposal. I don't believe there is any reasonable doubt that due process will be honored under the proposal as drawn. I think we have spent enough money in attempting to educate our membership relative to the Manual. We have been to court over and over and over again, and have won each time on the proposition, that a voluntary organization developing rules and regulations in a democratic manner has a right to do and they must be followed. We have much better use for our money than the continual drain on our treasury to pay legal fees to help educate coaches and others that refuse to learn what their Manual says or refuse to honor what their institutions have approved. I strongly urge your support.

Ronald Oyer (Denver University): I would like to rise in opposition to this proposal and urge the members to vote against it. It offers, basically, no protection to the member institutions because the NCAA is a voluntary organization and they are not obligated to due process as we know in our legal system.

For an institution this may very well be the difference between a \$500,000 or a \$50,000 lawsuit, and I would agree that there is a necessity for member institutions to become familiar with the Bylaws and the Constitution and apply them and exhaust internal remedies, but it offers no protection to the member institutions.

It offers protection to the NCAA. I urge you to vote against it.

Mr. Plant: With respect to the remarks of the last speaker, I would not want the membership to understand there is no protection in the NCAA procedures in the way of due process. There are elaborate protections. The NCAA is held repeatedly to be state actions, subject to the 14th Amendment, and everyone I know on the Infractions Committee and the Council is fully cognizant of that.

If anyone has ever undergone an investigation, you know there is a great deal of due process involved. On the point of the inept language, perhaps my own expression was inept. I did not mean to say that the language could not be appropriately construed or could not be appropriately applied. It ought not to be assumed that the Council will act arbitrarily or that it will disregard the place of its own lawyers. With this record on the books as to what is meant by those ambiguous phrases, those broad phrases, it seems to me there is adequate basis for having confidence that the legislation will be applied in a sensible and non-arbitrary manner.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): Could I ask Dr. Plant something? I did furnish Mr. Brown the other day with a memorandum from our general counsel on this matter, and you did address the first of the three questions he raised, which was the removal of the phrase "directly or indirectly." Do you feel your statement of intent here has met his objections on points two and three? That is just as a matter of record.

Mr. Plant: Yes, I have examined the opinion that came from your counsel, and there is no question that it does. It is my judgment that what has been said here by me is sufficient to protect any institution from the ambiguities.

Mr. Horn: Just so the record will be complete, I would like to insert our counsel's opinion in the record.

[The complete transcript containing California State, Long Beach's Counsel's opinion is on file in the NCAA national office.]

President Fuzak: The question has been called for and this requires a two-thirds majority, being a constitutional amendment, of the body.

[Proposal No. 215 (page A-90) was defeated.]

Delegate: Could I ask a point of clarification? No. 213 regarding the student-athlete's statement failed. We were sent the form to use with a couple of sets of rules, and based on our '75-'76 Manual. With this Convention and with many changes, some of which will be in the rules, when are we to start using this or will we get updated sheets to start using this form? That is just a guideline. I know it says "immediately," I believe, or as soon as possible. Of course, all of us want to start mimeographing and getting this done. When would we start?

President Fuzak: I am getting advice from every direction. I am uncertain. We will provide you with an interpretation along the way. Are you ready, Warren?

Warren Brown (NCAA Staff): The student-athletes which have already completed the form, of course, would not be required to complete a new form based upon the changes in the rules. For the sports teams, members of which have not yet completed the form, they would not be expected to sign the new rules until they were actually circulated by our office to the member institution. That only leaves the question of those rules that are no longer applicable that might be on the old form. Of course, if they are no longer applicable and not of any continuing application to the student, it would seem to me this would be moot as part of the form.

It would have been immediately in terms of the institutions having in hand the changes circulated from our office. If you don't have them, of course, the student would not have read them and he wouldn't be held accountable for them.

President Fuzak: I would hope members would not ask for interpretations, because we still have some very important issues before us. If it is not related to reconsideration, or something of that kind, please hold your interpretation questions and give them to the office. I am sure you will receive a prompt answer.

Certification of Compliance

Hubert Heitman (University of California, Davis): I move adoption of Proposal No. 216.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a housekeeping amendment about which there has been some question arise as to whether the chief campus executive officer's certification forms should be sent in to the NCAA or not. This would make it very clear that either an original or a copy should be.

[Proposal No. 216 (page A-90) was approved by all three divisions.]

Institutional Eligibility

Harry Cross (University of Washington): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 217.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the intent identifies, this is an attempt to put in a little bit more understandable language in the provision concerning institutional certification for NCAA events when a staff member has been suspended from coaching duties for violation of the "Principles of Ethical Conduct."

[Proposal No. 217 (page A-91) was approved by all three divisions.]

Enforcement Procedure

Jack Sawyer (Wake Forest University): I move the adoption of Item No. 218.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is one of those technical things. It is a carry over from the old infractions procedure. This is to eliminate the vice-presidents from those included in the notification procedure regarding infractions inquiries, inasmuch as the Council is no longer the hearing body in infractions matter.

[Proposal No. 218 (page A-91) was approved.]

Due Process

Ray Whispell (Muhlenberg College): This has to do with the rec-

commended policy only, and is to encourage a member institution to provide an informal hearing to a student-athlete involved in the application of NCAA eligibility regulations by the institution. I move adoption of Proposal No. 219.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Weaver: I would like to speak in opposition to No. 219. You know, in these times it is unwise to be against due process. I feel this should be redrafted. The first thing that is wrong with this, I don't think it is possible to do what the legislation requests, and that is to not delay or set aside your requirements of O.I. 18. O.I. 18 demands immediately the institution withhold the athlete from intercollegiate competition and yet No. 219 requires that a hearing be given after action is taken. My second objection, I believe in a hypothetical case it would be possible for a member of your institution outside of the athletic department, such as a vice-president of student affairs, someone in that capacity, to prevent or to require one of your athletes not to take part in an athletic practice because of disruption on your campus, et cetera. He would be able to compete and practice until the hearing had been given. I think the wiser thing to do would be to give the opportunity to remove from practice and with a certain time limit in which the hearing should be given.

[Proposal No. 219 (page A-92) was approved.]

Determination of Divisions

Stan Marshall (NCAA Secretary-Treasurer, South Dakota State University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 220.

[The motion was seconded.]

Very quickly, this is a matter of clearing up some of the uncertainty as to what is required when you are desiring to change divisions. This is to maintain a balance between complete movement year by year, and a more restrictive stance. It does not pertain to the scheduling requirement, so it does not force you to put your schedule in order for two years for those that have had that concern. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 220 (page A-92) was approved by all three divisions.]

Change of Divisional Membership

Mr. Marshall: On behalf of the Council, I move approval of No. 221.

[The motion was seconded.]

This applies to the institution and provides for the same manner of making a divisional change as in No. 220 by sport. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 221 (page A-93) was approved by all three divisions.]

Institutional Eligibility

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I move adoption of No. 222 on behalf of the Council. Briefly, it was discovered last fall that unless there was a change in Article 10, as you see it listed, that Divisions II and III would be excluded from NCAA championships in which there is only one championship.

The sports are listed; and I think they are ice hockey, indoor

track, fencing, cross country and so on. This simply provides that Divisions II and III can compete in those championships by their own rules and not to be confused with the regulation that a III or II school going up in one sport must meet the requirements of all the rules of the eligibility of the sport in Division I, if that is what their option is. This simply relates to the cases that are listed here. I would hope that there would be no confusion on that.

[The motion was seconded.]

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I urge support and passage of this amendment. It is very meaningful to Divisions II and III institutions and provides them with the opportunity, as the previous speaker just indicated, of using the other eligibility rules in the competition where there is only one championships.

[Proposal No. 222 (page A-93) was approved by all three divisions.]

Membership Division—Classification Committee

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference): In behalf of the Reorganization Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposition No. 223.

[The motion was seconded.]

When I first read and heard the Council's resolution relative to reorganization, I was somewhat critical of the Council's criticism of the Interim Classification Committee; but further reflection has led me to the conclusion that those were the kindest words that were spoken by the Interim Classification during the meeting thus far. [Laughter]

Nevertheless, I strongly support the adoption of this amendment, which would establish a permanent Classification Committee. I feel, regardless of how you may feel about the other aspects of reorganization, that this Association needs to have a permanent Classifications Committee. You will recall that prior to the adoption of reorganization in August, 1973, there was a committee which fulfilled this function. With reorganization, the task of considering changes in divisional status was assigned to the Council. I think for the very reason that the Interim Classification Committee was criticized for the time span in which it had to operate and for the reasons of perhaps not considering every aspect of this constitutional classification, that we certainly need a permanent committee to deal with this subject.

The Council is in no position to do this without a much greater burden being added to it, and it is entirely appropriate that a permanent committee be established.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): I want to take this opportunity to remind the Convention that the Council proposes, in conjunction with this, a substitute resolution on No. 225, but the importance of my calling this to your attention is the importance of the passage of No. 223 in these steps. The passage of No. 223 will be essential if we are to make progress in the developments called for in the proposed Resolution No. 225-4.

Ed Crowder (University of Colorado): I would like to move that we adopt No. 224, as an amendment to Item No. 223.

[The motion was seconded.]

Briefly, this amendment to the amendment provides for a Divisional Classification Committee in each division which would deal with the determination of its members, a determination of the division for its members. I would point out in the process also an appeal is available to any member who is not satisfied with the manner in which his divisional classification has dealt with him or his institution. He may appeal to the Council and the Council has power to override that division.

Mickey Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): I would rise in opposition to the amendment, not so much on the basis that the Divisional Classification Committees might not be the most appropriate manner in which to handle such questions, when you are talking about moving from one division to another, my objection comes to the word "reclassification." I don't think a separate committee in each division should be in a position to rule upon reclassification. It would seem to me that there would then cease to exist any checks and balances if each committee were independent. What would exist at all levels would be a potential block out.

Edgar Sherman (Muskingum College): I oppose the amendment for these reasons. This amendment is in opposition to the intent and spirit of the original reorganization legislation that was passed in 1973. At that time, the committee spent much time in trying to decide how the committee should be organized. The Council and the Executive Committee, and all the other committees of the organization, have representation from each one of the divisions. The second reason is that under this proposal a new member might not be able to find a division for a home. The same thing might apply to those of us who are now members.

In effect, it would create many problems. The third reason, one of the reasons for the reconvening of the Reorganization Committee, was to stop wholesale movement from one division to another and provide some method that an institution might move to have legitimate reasons and have fulfilled the criteria of moving to a new division.

The fourth reason is the proposal in effect should have—the proposal could have the effect of freezing all movements from one division to another. If we wished to continue as one organization under one umbrella, we should defeat this amendment.

Robert Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Association): The Eastern College Athletic Association has some of the concerns Mr. Sherman raised. We, therefore, ask you to vote against this amendment. [Proposal No. 224 (page A-95) was defeated in all three divisions.]

President Fuzak: We are now back to No. 223. I would like to call your attention, since there was a reference to No. 225, this was withdrawn by the Council and a resolution substituted for it. Unfortunately, this was misnumbered as 225-1. It is actually 225-4.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I am not sure whether it is appropriate to begin this discussion between Nos. 223 and 225, but let me express my concern and see if the Council can enlighten me. My concern is that we not start down a process which seems to be trying to clean up what was done not very openly this past year, not very efficiently and not very effec-

tively. The group that met this past year took individual institutions and conferences, cost member institutions, I suspect, in this room, hundreds of thousands of revenue in booster money by the way they went about their business as people began to be classified and labeled I and I-A.

I think somewhere along the line the Convention and the Council ought to agree to—maybe your Long Range Planning Committee is the group—sit down and seriously ask yourselves just what specifically are the criteria to be in Division I, II and III.

You might survey the membership to see where we are, what are reasonable criteria and develop that without reference to picking and choosing, and get the next Convention to agree to those criteria.

I would argue that in such a Convention, the total membership, Division I, II and III, as currently constituted, have a philosophical stake to be represented in that decision. The question we ought to ask as members of the NCAA is when is enough enough? What are the reasonable ground rules for Division I; what are the reasonable ground rules for Division II and Division III?

Whether this is the appropriate time or later, my own feeling is, I think the Convention would be wise to table all these proposals and let the Council get an ad hoc committee together or Long Range Planning Committee to seriously study this matter in a responsible way without it looking like to the outsider and to the public at large that those that are in get their friends in and those that are out then are told hurdles that are so vague no one knows what it takes to get in.

Mr. Holmes: I will not speak on No. 223 in the broad terms of President Horn. In fact, I think I could find myself very much in favor of No. 223 if I could be sure of a couple of things. If I were sure that the intent of it is to substitute the committee, the Classification Committee, for the Council in this process, I think I could be for this legislation.

To the point, in Section 2, it is stated that if the Classification Committee determines that a member has met all applicable criteria, if any, of the division to which it intends to transfer, the member shall be transferred to the new division effective the September 1 following submission of the petition.

Whereas, under the large B, paragraph (b), it states, "At the time of application, a prospective member shall designate the membership division it desires. The membership application shall be considered by the Classification Committee, which shall determine the division for which prospective member qualifies under the applicable criteria." Then it states, "The application then shall be submitted for possible election to membership." My first question is related to the statement, "The application then shall be submitted for possible election," whereas, in Section 2, it states the members shall be transferred immediately to the new division.

Which is correct? The second point is who will do the electing? Who will be doing the voting if it is placed before some body for possible election?

Mr. Sherman: There are two things. I think the first question deals with those who want to move. The second question deals with those who are making an original application. I think the intent of the

committee, when it made this proposal, was that this Classification Committee would be established. Then if someone applied to be in a division, the first thing the Classification Committee would do would be to review the criteria as they have been established by the divisions; and then after doing that, they would decide whether they were eligible for that division or not.

That is one of the things that got us into this mess. As you know, after reorganization in August, 1973, the divisions themselves did not establish very many criteria for their own use.

Mr. Holmes: Is it correct for me to assume, then, Ed, when you talk in terms of possible election, you are talking in terms of a vote of the Classification Committee itself, rather than the election being a part of the division itself?

Mr. Sherman: I think after the criteria is established, if the institution meets the criteria, then the Classification Committee simply reviews the institution as to whether they have met the criteria or not. If they have, they will be put in the division. If they have not, they wouldn't.

Mr. Holmes: What was wrong with the change that existed there beforehand?

Mr. Sherman: I didn't write the language. I can't answer that question.

President Fuzak: I would like to call to your attention what the intent of the Council is. We spent many, many hours discussing this. If No. 223 is adopted, the intent is to follow what is indicated in No. 225-4. I think it is very important that you read No. 225-4, because that will be the procedure that is followed if No. 223 is adopted. If this is not adopted, of course, we stay with what is in there now.

Arthur DeGenaro (Mansfield State College): It is nice to have the back of the bus represented once in awhile. I would like a point of personal privilege. In a rather tedious Convention, I would like to compliment you on what appears your patience of Job here in a rather perfunctory proceeding. [Applause]

I would also like to know if it is in order to get some reaction. Earlier, you indicated there might be a change of order and I, for one, am very interested in sharing with my president when I get back the consensus or the Convention feeling on Nos. 325, 327 and 326. If it is out of order, please don't hesitate to rule so. We are all sort of waiting at the block ready to catch planes. I think you can get the consensus of what I am saying.

President Fuzak: We are scheduled to go until 1 p.m. Then we will reconvene at 2 p.m., and we will take up the issue related to women's sports. That is, we will consider that or by common consent we can take it right up.

C. H. Gilstrap (Appalachian State University): I think some of the discomfort comes from the fact that the criteria are not spelled out. Despite that weakness, I think that No. 223 represents progress. I urge its passage.

George Bissacca (Eastern College Athletic Conference): In view of the correlation of Nos. 223 and 225, I would like to speak momentarily to both of those. Our conference favors the passage of both Nos. 223 and 225.

President Fuzak: Are you talking about 225-4?

Mr. Bissacca: Yes. I am sorry, it is 225-4. It might be helpful to consider these thoughts so that the members will be better informed on both Nos. 223 and 225-4. In view of our previous challenge, the original No. 225, therefore, we would like to make some explanations. We have also recognized the seriousness of the problems confronting the Division I football members.

We are as anxious as everyone in the room to see that problem resolved. As we pointed out on Wednesday, we felt that the procedure established by the original No. 225 was out of order because it gave the committee the power to move a member from one division to another, even though that member was conforming to existing criteria which the members of the division had voted upon. Now, 225-4 avoids that fatal defect by limiting the power of the committee, which is to be established in No. 223, to simply reviewing and making recommendations. For this reason, we feel No. 223 is not objectionable. However, while No. 225-4 is accordingly not out of order, in our opinion, we are concerned, as is everyone here who has expressed their thoughts just a moment ago, as to whether the committee will have the ability to accomplish its important task before the next Convention.

We are concerned because two possible procedures are available to them in doing their work under the language which is sufficiently broad in this resolution to include both. First, they can adopt procedures such as they did leading to this Convention. In such case, I would imagine they would not be very helpful, they would accomplish the task. On the other hand, there are procedures available which we, in the interest of all the members in the Division I, would like to suggest for their consideration. First, we would suggest that the committee should develop definitive criteria rather than operate under the vague guidelines set out in No. 226. Once these specific criteria are developed, they should be immediately communicated to the memberships.

This will give the members a chance to evaluate their programs in accordance with the criteria; and in some cases, they may even begin to adjust their programs so they can meet the criteria. Thereafter, the committee should make its classifications solely on the basis of the criteria which they suggest. Once the classifications are made, they should be communicated to the membership. At this point, any member who wished to appeal could, as indicated under No. 225-4. In this way, gentlemen, we feel that the number of appeals would be diminished enormously.

First of all, if a particular member found it impossible to meet the criteria, there would be no point in his appealing and his option would be limited to voting against the criteria at the next Convention. On the other hand, if, with some reasonable diligence, he might meet the criteria in a year or so, might appeal to the Council for probationary status, or whatever.

President Fuzak: George, I don't wish to be technical, but I don't see you wearing a badge.

Mr. Bissacca: I am sorry.

President Fuzak: Okay. Is this as a visitor?

Mr. Bissacca: I don't know what it is. They just give it to me each

year. [Laughter] Now, we would suggest when the entire procedure is completed, at the next annual Convention the members of Division I be first given an opportunity to vote on the criteria. If the criteria are passed, then the classifications would take effect. If the criteria are defeated, then, of course, they would fail. If we do not adhere to some procedures substantially in line with what we have suggested, we are afraid that the committee may do an awful lot of work over the next year to no avail, once again, since the member could raise the same points of order as to reclassification of members without opportunity to vote on criteria.

For these reasons, we sincerely support the passage of both Nos. 223 and 225-4, and we trust that the committee will operate under some procedures substantially as we have outlined.

Harry Cross (University of Washington): I want to identify and I hope we remove some confusion that I think following Mickey Holmes' question, of the different language in No. 223. In the first part of B in No. 223 has to do with a member first seeking membership in the Association. This provides the Classification Committee shall look at the information from the application for admission and determine whether the criteria are satisfied. Having determined that, then it says, yes, run it through the ordinary election process to membership.

With the movement of an existing member from one division to another, it merely substitutes the Classification Committee for the Council in that process of movement.

Mr. Gilstrap: This is my first NCAA Convention and I can tell you it is very interesting. [Laughter] I would also like to commend the patience and the democratic operation of our chairman. I wish I could do as well. I apologize speaking out at my first meeting, but I feel compelled.

Up until now, we have very carefully followed the Constitution. I really think that we are trying now to make an end run around the plan. For six years, the alumni, faculty members and students of Appalachian State University have made a pledge and dedication to try to meet the requirements of Division I in all sports. We raised millions of dollars. We built new facilities. We remodeled others.

Three years ago, we were admitted to Division I in all sports. If this legislation passes, you are breaking faith with institutions like Appalachian State University. Since we are discussing No. 223, I have no objection. I am talking about and objecting to No. 225, if this action is taken to create more divisions. If this passes, then the same thing can happen in basketball. The Constitution provides for the future powers to raise criteria that was just mentioned. I agree to that. I think they ought to do so. It also provides five years for those people in Division I at that time, when the criteria is raised, to meet those. I would like to continue to follow that and that the standards that are passed by Division I are those which my institution can meet, and it will not take me five years to decide that. If not, then I will move myself out. I also would like to point out that the resolution uses new math instead of I, II, III and IV.

The resolution No. 225 deals with moving into I and I-A. The

new math might be I, II, III and I-A. It is basically I, II, III, IV. A lot of the institutions think they are going to move up to I-A. They are not moving up, they are moving to II or staying in Division II. Everybody will be moved down one division, except those that stay in Division I and those that stay in Division II. I called home and talked to my attorney, and he said that No. 225 is unconstitutional. I know my attorney. He makes more mistakes than I do. [Laughter]

President Fuzak: You are aware that No. 225 has been withdrawn?

Mr. Gilstrap: I am talking about No. 255-4, sir. Whether or not this is unconstitutional, No. 225-4 sets a precedent which will allow sudden change in the Constitution which would be unfair to institutions who have invested time, dedication and money in trying to meet the criteria which you have established for Division I. All I ask you to do is to change the criteria in Division I and give me a reasonable chance to meet them. If I can't meet them, then move me.

Bob Nye (University of Texas, Dallas): We are presently making application for associate membership. What would be the criteria for us being accepted into Division I, eliminating football and basketball, involving the four other sports, during next year? If we were to make application prior to June 1, could we be accepted into Division I for championship next year?

President Fuzak: Under the present requirements, any application will be under present requirements. Let me say that it seems to me there have been several points missed on this because the resolution directs the Classification Committee to even look at the advisability of creating a I and I-A in football, among other things. In answer to your question, whatever the present are, are the ones that would apply to you if you applied for membership.

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): I would like to urge all members of Division II to pass Proposal No. 223; and then if you follow the orderly procedure, the Council has planned No. 225-4, and all of our requests will have been met by this particular time next year. We will receive the benefits of reorganization should it pass. Please vote for No. 223.

[Proposal No. 223 (page A-94) was approved by all three divisions.]

Resolution: Reorganization

[Proposal No. 225 (page A-96) was withdrawn.]

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the Council, I should like to propose to this Convention the adoption of Resolution No. 225-4.

[The motion was seconded.]

If I may say a few brief words, I think our distinguished legal attorneys to the north of us have made some very excellent points; and for me to reiterate some of these I think would be wasting your time. Let me hit a couple of the high spots.

The Council, of course, has tried to be fully knowledgeable and aware of the various concerns of our members and a lot of this was expressed in the round tables. For this reason, the Council felt it should lay out a more orderly process. I think that it should be apparent to everyone we have attempted to lead this in such terms as

to give the Reclassification Committee an opportunity to work.

There is not much use for us to recall the problems that the Interim Classification provided for us, and you see the wording there, but I did want to point out that the first charge to the committee will be to examine the I and I-A Classification in the sport of football, and to determine if this should be something that should be considered by our Association.

In doing so, of course, it establishes procedures and these have been dealt with, and the committee has some leeway to work on this. But I should point out that it has to make certain reports as indicated in the "RESOLVED." Also, I should point out that it does provide for hearings.

These hearings are available to everyone. The features under the "RESOLVED" are important to us. They must complete their studies and reviews, considerations as outlined therein by July 1, 1976, and that all appeals to the NCAA Council for consideration by member institutions shall be adjudicated no later than October 1, 1976, and that we have final notice of the proposed classification distributed and the Council, of course, will mail all these to the members. Finally, of course, it will be the order of business at our next Convention. This is laid out. Of course, the important thing is that this will have the review of the 71st Annual Convention and in this respect we feel that we have provided an orderly process. Let's get the reorganization. It is necessary to hold this Association together, and I urge your adoption of this resolution.

Mickey Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): I would be quite supportive of this resolution, particularly the first three paragraphs. For those of us who have been injured, this is quite important, although it will not repair the damage already done. I would be supportive of the last portion of this if we could be reasonably sure that the guidelines as outlined by Mr. Baeseca will be followed in all these steps during this interim, and that we will have a procedure established for committee guidance that will be in conformance with all requirements of our Constitution and Bylaws.

Richard Lyman (Stanford University): I appreciate the consideration of the Council in withdrawing No. 225 and proposing what is clearly a better set of procedures. I still have a question in mind, and the question is this: if the Classification Committee is set up, which we have set up, goes through all these steps, goes through the procedure and having fought through the I and I-A problem, then makes decisions and brings the whole thing in on the table on time and schedule, is there any reality left in the freedom of decision of the Convention next year on the basis whether there should be four divisions instead of three?

It seems to me we will find ourselves with an accomplished fact in a large degree. I can foresee the argument, even in the strength of only one NCAA Convention, one begins to develop some sense of the argument. I can almost hear them now in January 1977. We have gone to all this trouble and all this work, this careful review has been accomplished to see whether institutions belong to Division I or Division I-A. You can't now turn around and say you don't want Division I and I-A, you want to stay with Division I we have. It seems to me that we are pre-empting the role of the Convention

next year if we pass No. 225-4. I think we will not be prejudging the issue if we proceed with the review of the matter without going into all this business of tentative classifications. I don't see any way of doing that under No. 225-4. We are opposed to No. 225-4.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I am in complete agreement with President Lyman. That is the concern of many of us. That is the point I tried to make earlier. The first question is the philosophic one, what does this Association want to become? How do we want to be divided?

In order to help us answer that, it would be quite useful if the committee studied the problem, gathered data, came up with some tentative recommendations. But I think as President Lyman said, we foreclose the benefits of group discussions at annual Conventions to look at just what should be the parameters of these. I think we are also foreclosed by not having an opportunity to see the development of objective criteria, to be able to offer amendments in an annual Convention and have group debate, to have the chance to change some of this criteria. Therefore, I would suggest in voting on this resolution we divide the "Resolve" clauses and we go through it so that some of us who have particular concerns can voice them on specific "Resolves."

Andrew Brown (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I hate to disagree with the two gentlemen that appeared before, but I think if we take a very close look at No. 225-4, it points out in the fourth paragraph, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the permanent NCAA Classification Committee be directed to review the advisability of creating Divisions I and I-A in the sport of football."

And then further, going on, establishing those or classifying those particular institutions which would qualify. We have heard the two previous speakers suggestion that we conduct a study, review and then say who should be classified. I raise the question, when will we arrive at reorganization? Why not confine the studies as in No. 225-4 and make it one shot for one? Make it one long shot and reclassification or reorganization has occurred and move out to the business of creating a better image of intercollegiate athletics in the United States.

President Fuzak: We have reached the announced recess time. I should like to take a vote on this but it would require three votes on each one of these.

Frank Bonner (Southern Conference): I fear that in this sense of urgency, which I feel is not necessarily desirable, that the same mistakes will be made during this coming period if this resolution is passed that were made by the Interim Committee. Why do we have to proceed during this organizational period, reorganization, without knowing what the criteria are? This is the point. I agree with President Horn. We should be able to see the definitive criteria and discuss them in this meeting before we are reclassified or before there is even a study of the advisability of reclassification. I am afraid, as I said before, if we pass this resolution, we will be faced with the same problems we had posed by the Interim Committee.

Mr. Holmes: Would it be fair to ask the question? Why was the original No. 225 withdrawn?

President Fuzak: Well, because this was only to have been a sam-

ple, but apparently no one in this outfit or many did not believe it to be. Many times, it was stated from the beginning, and there were some appeals heard, others apparently were not, in an illustrative list; and we believed all along that no decision had been made. It was merely illustrated. This is a mistake we will not repeat. To some extent, what I hear is a proposal to repeat that. I think that would be in great error.

Mr. Holmes: Does this not have some of the ingredients of the original No. 225, in that a committee was convened when empowered outside of Constitutional limits? If that committee is going to evaluate or establish criteria, or what criteria might be established in a future time, it is within the limits of the Constitution.

If we are going on nebulous statements, non-definitive statements on what the evaluation might be, now, we are talking about an individual judgment factor. As you met before a committee member and presented your position, you are strictly in an individual judgment situation. He is evaluating your program against his, unless we stick to the definitive criteria.

Stanley McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): I know that some have called for the question, but I believe this is a matter of such importance that we should discuss it thoroughly. I commend the NCAA Council for withdrawing No. 225 and heartily agree that 225-4 represents great improvements.

However, I think the serious weakness of it would cause me to vote against it and cause me to ask you to vote against it. It implies, it seems to me, without stating it directly, that we are going to have Divisions I and I-A. I would much prefer that we vote directly on that kind of question. Now, it is true that it states only review the advisability of, but in the entire process, I believe what will come out is recommended divisions and members of those divisions. As was stated by President Lyman, we will be presented at the next Convention with what is tantamount to a fact complete.

I think if you are in favor of the divisional sections as provided in No. 225, you will want to vote for this. If you are opposed to that kind of an arrangement, you would clearly want to vote against it. In voting for it you are, I believe, in effect, voting for the establishment of the new divisions. I urge you to vote against it.

Mr. Thompson: It will be short, indeed. I must say, we are experiencing the same difficulty that we did with the original list. We have said very plainly this Convention will have the opportunity of reviewing the actions of this committee and the Council. For this reason, nothing is being taken away. It is all in the hands of the 71st Convention. I urge you, let's proceed on this, because there is a lot of important actions of the NCAA down the road affected in this area.

President Fuzak: I have to be certain whether that was an official request from President Horn to vote each one of these.

Mr. Horn: I would think we should vote on these separately.

President Fuzak: You do request it?

Mr. Horn: I am not happy with the July 1, 1976, deadline. I think this should come back to the Convention. I think there are differences in this language.

President Fuzak: Dr. Horn has requested that the four "RESOLVED"

portions, that is, starting with the second one, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the permanent NCAA Classification Committee be directed to review the advisability of creating," et cetera—I guess if we do that, we have to vote on each one of them. There are five.

"Now, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association hereby officially records its disapproval of the sample listing distributed to this Convention January 15, 1976." Then we will go through one at a time, and this is a resolution, so it will just take a majority.

William Baughn (University of Colorado): Don't we have to decide whether we want to divide these various items?

President Fuzak: You can, if you wish, ask for approval for that. The chair can grant it. But if you challenge that, you can ask for a vote of approval.

Mr. Baughn: I request it.

[The request was seconded.]

Mr. Horn: I request and urge that we vote against the whole works.

President Fuzak: Now, we are not dividing the question as to approval of No. 225-4.

[Proposal No. 225-4 (page A-135) was approved, 180-135.]

[The Convention recessed at 1:15 p.m.]

FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

Saturday Afternoon, January 17, 1976

The session convened at 2:15 p.m., President John A. Fuzak, presiding.

17. OPENING REMARKS

President Fuzak: I recognize that there may be some problems with people checking out, but I hope we can get underway. What I propose to do, although I indicated that we would take up questions on women's athletics right after lunch, I don't think it will take us long to complete the issues related to reorganization. Since several have been withdrawn, we will proceed to try to clean that up. If we get bogged down, I will interrupt; and we will go to the women's resolutions. If that is satisfactory, we will continue.

18. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Membership Divisions—Guidelines

Edgar Sherman (Muskingum College): I move Proposal No. 226.
[The motion was seconded.]

I think it is self-explanatory, since it provides for the classification with guidelines for consideration.

[Proposal No. 226 (page A-96) was approved by all three divisions.]

Membership Divisions—Probationary Status

Mr. Sherman: I move Proposal No. 227.

[The motion was seconded.]

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): On behalf of the Big Eight Conference, I would like to move amendment No. 228 to Proposal No. 227.

[The motion was seconded.]

Let me explain the purpose of this. It is self-explanatory. But in No. 227, there is a provision for probationary membership of institutions that have not met the criteria for the division. All No. 228 does is says while an institution is on this probationary status, that they will not have a vote in the new division. It seems that is only fair where they have met this criteria, they shouldn't be voting then upon changes that might occur within that position.

C. D. Henry (Big Ten Conference): The Reorganization Committee, the majority, at least since Mr. Swank was on the Committee also, are against No. 228. The majority felt strongly that was too confusing, a change in divisions, even though they do not presently qualify for that division. As Mr. Swank so vividly explained, No. 228 would not allow that. A primary goal in the creation of No. 227 was to permit some institutions to escape restrictive limitations on recruiting and on grants-in-aid which would weaken the program to the extent that the institution could not compete while it worked to meet the criteria for a change in membership.

We generally ask you to defeat No. 228 and vote for the Reorganization Committee's Proposal No. 227.

Mr. Swank: I don't want to debate C.D. on this. He made one mistake. He said you could not move to a new division. This doesn't prohibit the moving to a new division. All it does is prevent voting while you are still on the probationary status.

John Toner (University of Connecticut): What would this do to a Division I school relegated to Division II football in terms of its voting privilege?

Mr. Swank: At the present time, Division II doesn't have any criteria. I suppose they would be voting immediately. If Division II creates criteria for its division, then I assume one would have to meet their criteria. Until it does establish some, one will be immediately eligible for voting.

Mr. Henry: On the other hand, if Proposal No. 227 is voted upon, then the institution would vote in the division to which it was seeking membership. To answer the question that the previous gentleman asked, he would be voting in Division II if he was on a probationary status, voting with Division I where all the remainder of his programs are.

[Proposal No. 228 (page A-97) was defeated by all three divisions.]

[Proposal No. 227 (page A-97) was passed by all three divisions.]

[Proposal No. 229 (page A-98) was withdrawn.]

Division I Criteria

Mr. Sherman: I move Proposition No. 230.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Sherman: At this time, I move the amendment No. 230-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe the amendment is simply a matter of correcting the words, the adding of "regardless of its conference schedule" at the end.

[Proposal No. 230-1 (page A-136) was approved by Division I football.]

Proposal No. 230 is a recommendation of the Reorganization Committee and provides an opportunity for an institution which is a member of a conference to petition for membership in the sport of football in Division I on the basis of its non-conference schedule, regardless of its conference schedules. This would permit a member of Division II, which plays six or seven games in its Division II conference, an opportunity to become a member of the Division I by playing 60 per cent of its non-conference games against members of that division.

To retain Division I membership, it would have to continue to play 60 per cent of its non-conference schedule against members of that division.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): The only thing that bothers me about this, is that a conference school can have a Division II schedule and then just play three games on the outside. If two of those are against Division I schools, they could be admitted to Division I. I wonder if this was the intent.

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference): The word "petition" is in there.

Mr. Sherman: They will have to be the 60 per cent.

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): May I ask a question for clarification? Is this not establishing future criteria relative to Division I and Division I-A? For instance, if the reorganization goes through later, and if there is a Division I-A, this would require Division I-A, if it is not a member of the conference that has been Division I previously, to play not only a conference schedule with Division I-A schools, if they are classified I-A, but also require them to play 60 per cent of their non-conference games against Division I.

In effect, this will make it closed shop, as far as the Division I-A institution ever gaining membership in Division I. If Division I institutions in football would not play the Division I-A institutions in the future, how will it ever be possible for a I-A school ever to get Division I classification? I maintain this does establish future criteria relative to football in membership in Divisions I and I-A.

Kenneth Germann (Southern Conference): As I understood it, gentlemen, that is not correct. I asked Tom Hansen the other day if reclassification took place and you were in I-A and you had six conference games in I-A with five non-conference games, even though you had six I-A games, and you played three out of five in I-A against I, even though you had only three Division I games out of 11, you could petition to be Division I. That is, three out of your remaining five. So you could have three games in Division I and eight games in I-A, and petition to be Division I. That was explained to me by Tom Hansen. Mr. Byers just nods that is correct.

President Fuzak: I would like to point out what it does here is provide that the other alternative is there, that it applies to Division I. Of course, what you are saying, it could become I from I-A.

Mr. Hill: That is what I am saying.

Frederick Gruninger (Rutgers University): Will you please define for me how the effective date that we have just related to in the last piece of legislation will apply since we will not be really voting on anything until January? I am concerned that the effective date might have some sort of deeper meaning.

President Fuzak: No, I am sure it doesn't. I'd better be certain of this. It applies to legislation as it now exists, so it applies to the Division I criteria and Division I football as it now exists. I don't understand your question, sir.

Mr. Gruninger: Well, I am concerned if these guidelines, which are the ones that are being established for classification—and in establishing them that we do have an identification of a possible Division I and I-A prior to coming here next year, which is based upon an August 1, 1976, deadline—and those of us who are dealing with schedules in the future and have some possible changes could be affected by a one-year situation very dramatically. I would not like to see that labeled on us.

Mr. Sherman: You are talking about an opportunity to petition here, and it seems to me it wouldn't be effective until he was reclassified.

[Proposal No. 230 (page A-98) was defeated by Division I football, 48-75.]

Division I Criteria

Mr. Sherman: I move Proposal No. 231 be adopted.
[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Sherman: I move the amendment to Proposal No. 231 numbered 231-1 be approved.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Sherman: The amendment is the same kind of word change we had in the last one.

President Fuzak: This is an editorial change.

[Proposal No. 231-1 (page A-136) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Sherman: The proposal provides an opportunity for an institution which is a member of the conference to petition for membership in the sport of basketball in Division I on the basis of its non-conference schedule, regardless of its conference schedule. This would permit a member of Division II, which plays six or seven games in its Division II conference, an opportunity to become a member of Division I by playing 60 per cent of its non-conference games against members of that division. To recap, the school would have to continue to play 60 per cent of its non-conference schedule against members of that division.

Mr. Gruninger: In No. 231, the second part, in a sense, I think it discriminates against conference and independent schools. It is to the effect independent schools play six games against Division II and Division III schools, which a conference aligned school can play only three if they are in an 18-team league, or four if 16-team conference games.

Doesn't the 75 per cent rule already affect the limit on the total number of games that a Division I school may play against Divisions II and III? I don't see where it discriminates against the conference aligned schools. I urge defeat of it.

[Proposal No. 231 (page A-99) was defeated by Division I.]

Membership Divisions

John Winkin (University of Maine, Orono): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 232.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 232 was submitted by the Reorganization Committee and specifies that each institution must continue to comply with the appropriate divisional membership criteria in order to maintain membership in that division.

[Proposal No. 232 (page A-99) was approved by all three divisions.]

[Proposals Nos. 233-238 (pages A-99-102) were withdrawn.]

Division III Criteria

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): Division III does want No. 239 approved, which would move the effective date from January, 1979, back to August, and make it a comparable date with the opening of the fall regular academic year. I guess to do that, we would have to have No. 238. I would like to see No. 238 held in there and move that No. 239 be approved very quickly. It will not take too much time.

President Fuzak: No. 239 stands on its own. The conclusion of the parliamentarian is that No. 239 stands alone and does not depend on No. 238.

Mr. Smith: I move Proposal No. 239.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 239 (page A-102) was approved by all three divisions.]
[Proposal No. 240 (page A-103) was withdrawn.]

Transfer of Membership

Ray Whispell (Muhlenburg College): I would like to move No. 241, a very simple proposal which enables the Mason-Dixon Conference to move into District II. It is very important.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Fuzak: I had made a promise, which I am not able to fulfill, but if that is your desire, we will move ahead with it. It shouldn't take too long. The question has been called for. This is a common Bylaw and must pass in each of the three divisions.

[Proposal No. 241 (page A-103) was approved by all three divisions.]

Someone will have to move a change in the order, which requires a two-thirds vote to move the resolutions that relate to the women's competitions.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): I move that we change the order of business and move those Nos. 325, 326, 327 and I think it is 327-1 to be considered next.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Resolution: Application of NCAA Rules

William Orwig (Indiana University): I move the adoption of Resolution No. 325.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 325-1 amends No. 325. You will notice in reading that over that the first four paragraphs of No. 325 remain unchanged and then where it says, "Now, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED" and under 1 the change is striking out "1977" and adding "1978" in its place. Mr. President I move the adoption of No. 325-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Let me put in perspective in as few words as possible the issues the NCAA as an organization and the member institutions of the organization face in the area of women's intercollegiate athletics. They are different issues, and yet they are interrelated.

First, we have been advised by our legal counsel that the NCAA organization is considered an arm of the state by the courts of the land. That is, that the NCAA is *state action* and has the same obligations under Federal law, particularly the 14th Amendment of the Constitution which assures equal rights, and the NCAA has the same obligations as a state university. Thus, the NCAA is facing the Federal mandate to provide programs to women student-athletes if under existing circumstances the woman athlete is, for practical purposes, excluded from those programs as a result of dominant skills of the male athlete.

Secondly, the rules of the NCAA at the present time do not differentiate between male and female student-athletes. Historically, the rules have been applied only to the male members of varsity intercollegiate teams or to the male and female members of a common team; and they customarily have been applied only to the staff members of member institutions who are involved in the administration and coaching of all-male or mixed teams. The existing discrimination is

obvious. Resolutions Nos. 325, as well as 326, address these issues. The NCAA Council feels it would be ignoring its responsibility if it did not seek an answer from the membership. Let me be clear, that if the separate-but-equal doctrine were acceptable in this area, I believe that the Council would be unanimous in urging our support of a separate-but-equal concept for men's and women's athletics.

We have not been able to find any qualified legal advice to support such a proposition. Thus, the question emerges as to whether the NCAA is going to begin the slow and the careful process of meeting the legal requirements of the Federal government or take no action, that is, not change previous custom and let the courts dictate to us.

Resolution No. 325 or 325-1 is the device that the Council has chosen to seek a division for the membership. If the resolution is defeated, the NCAA Council will apply the rules of the NCAA only to the employees, to the athletes and the athletic representatives in male or mixed college intercollegiate teams. If it is tabled or referred to the NCAA Council, then they will interpret these legislative actions in the same manner as rejections.

The Resolutions No. 325 and No. 325-1 provide for adequate space in time and that it could be changed at the next Convention. Thus, deferral or tabling means, in effect, a decision to contradiction and custom and, in effect, to leave this decision to the courts.

Let me very quickly outline the alternatives as I see them. If the Convention votes in favor of the amendment, it means we, as an Association, have taken a positive step in the legal direction. I think the lawyers were quite clear on this in our division round tables and in the general round table. If the vote is negative, it would mean that the rules are effective to men only. If there is a postponement, referral or deferral, then it leaves us in limbo; and the Council will proceed on the basis that the rules don't apply.

I feel also any delay of the Association's active involvement in women's athletics will leave us open to legal challenge. I urge this Convention to adopt Amendment No. 325-1.

President Fuzak: Since I permitted you to speak to both of these in combination, we will continue that process. I will allow discussion on the main motion, as well as the amended motion.

Richard Nelson (Northern Illinois University): In accordance with the resolution adopted in last year's Convention, a joint committee of the AIAW and the NCAA was created. It has met only twice so far, but it is the feeling of the women that progress is being made.

For example, two months ago, it designated a subcommittee to attempt to come up with a common set of eligibility rules. A recommendation from this joint committee would obviously have a much greater chance of approval from AIAW than a set of rules developed exclusively by men. I appreciate that an attempt has been made to mollify the women by this. Nevertheless, you will be asking the women to negotiate on what would be a coercive situation. You would be saying if we can't reach an agreement, it will be done our way. I believe that the defeat of this resolution would say to the AIAW we are prepared to sit down with you on equal terms. We are both aware of the time limitations imposed by Title IX and let us get on with it.

I defer to the collective wisdom of this group and its experience

in dealing with women. My personal judgment is that women are like men, in that they don't like to be pushed around.

Stanley McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): I wish to speak in opposition to this resolution, but I will explain the action that should be taken. As stated by Mr. Orwig in his presentation, there is legal recommendation that this be adopted at this time. If we should vote on this and approve it, we would be, I believe, as President Nelson has just said, proceeding in a manner to complicate the considerations and deliberations of the joint committee, which has been considering the matter and which I hope and believe will continue to consider the matter.

Moreover, we have had indications from the AIAW they hope we will not pass this. If our intention is, which I hope and believe it is, to proceed in good faith in our discussions and deliberations with the AIAW to hope to reach a resolution of our differences, we would be taking a very unwise action in adopting this. I think that is quite clear.

Secondly, if we should vote against this resolution, should defeat it, we would be going on record as an organization as restricting the NCAA to men. That, I believe, would be very unwise legally. Thus, it seems to me the wise course of action is to defer consideration of it and, accordingly, I move that this be referred to the NCAA Council for reference to the appropriate committee for further discussion.

[The motion was seconded.]

A. A. White (University of Houston): I am a lawyer. I am not sure whether that helps or hurts; but, anyway, I state for whatever significance it might have in evaluating what I have to say. This is a complicated area, but somewhat gingerly I take issue with the legal premise on which No. 325 was drawn. I state that for whatever value it may be in considering it. I think what has been done is to confuse the obligation of the member institutions with the obligations of the NCAA. I think the assumption has been erroneously made that the NCAA is the only organization through which the member institutions can discharge their obligations. I think it is erroneous to conclude that the NCAA must force on the women its rules and obligations and privileges.

President Fuzak: Sir, I may be wrong, but I think you are going beyond the permissible debate, in terms of referral. The debate relating to that does not relate to the main motion or the advisability of the main motion. I guess there is a gray area. Will you confine it to that, to the referral motion? That is what is before us.

Mr. White: I understood that. If you interpret what I am saying not as having relevance . . .

President Fuzak: I will have to tell you, I am really not sure.

Mr. White: To refer, they have to consider it on some basis. What I am saying is something that has reference to the light or the context in which they would consider it.

President Fuzak: I see. You may proceed.

Mr. White: I think there shows up here, where it is stated in the fourth "WHEREAS" that the NCAA cannot exclude or exempt women athletics. Now, I think certainly the NCAA cannot exclude them. But to say that they can't exempt them, when the women wish to

be exempted, if they do, I think is erroneous.

I think the NCAA has no obligation to pull women or drag women into its jurisdiction. People can reject, if they want to, their constitutional privileges or rights as they have competence to if they have a full understanding and are given a free opportunity to exercise their will, they can do that.

I think the legal premise on which No. 325 was drawn is erroneous, and I think in the reconsideration that premise should be questioned and not followed accurately.

Earl Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Approval of this referral would imply to me the need for the Council to prepare a revision more favorable to cooperative activity with the AIAW. I think that puts it in a procedural base, and would certainly receive my support.

Mr. Orwig: Just to comment and reply to the gentleman who spoke previous to Mr. Ramer, the NCAA employs legal counsel with the idea in mind that they will give us the type of counseling as to what is legal in their opinion. Somebody said the other day, if we had 30 attorneys, we would have 30 different opinions. I think that is no doubt true.

The only thing that your committee can go by and the only thing that the Council can go by is the legal opinions given to us by the attorneys for the NCAA. I do not profess to be a legal mind in any sense of the word, but that is the reasoning behind this particular proposal.

Ed Bennett (Washington State University): I would like to comment on what Bill said. The AIAW also has a staff of attorneys, and their opinions are diametrically opposed to the NCAA's. I would think there would be some room for real discussion and argument on the grounds of the validity of our attorneys' opinion.

[Proposal No. 325 (page A-128) was referred to the NCAA Council for further study and consideration.]

Resolution: Championships

John Eiler (East Stroudsburg State College): In behalf of the Council, I move Resolution No. 326 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The "resolved" on this pertains to holding championships for women. If you read the "resolved" it states, "that no championship meets or tournaments for exclusively female student-athlete participation shall be established by this Association for any season prior to the 1977-78 academic year, and thereafter as determined by the Association at the 71st Annual Convention."

Mr. Swank: I think the last paragraph of this does just exactly the same kind of thing that No. 325 did, in that it is trying to set final dates where we should start offering championships for women. If we are going to negotiate with the AIAW on any kind of honest, fair terms, this should be defeated. I move to table No. 327.

[The motion to table Proposal No. 326 (page A-129) was seconded and passed.]

Resolution: Committee and Study Program

Ed Betz (University of the Pacific): On behalf of the Council,

I should like to move the adoption of Resolution No. 327.

[The motion was seconded.]

You have the resolution before you. I should comment that a substitute motion was presented to the Council last night. It does not make any change in the content of the motion. It rearranges the paragraphs, perhaps words it more accurately, but the content is the same.

It was held it was not necessary to introduce the requested substitute resolution. In the hopes of getting one win out of three, let me read to you from the letter from the president of the AIAW.

As to Resolution No. 327, we are hopeful that the present members of the joint committee are asked by the NCAA to continue the discussions with the AIAW representatives.

We believe a great deal of understanding has been accomplished between these organizational representatives and that such understanding should not be lost for future discussions.

You will notice that No. 327 provides for a permanent committee on women's athletics with a subcommittee to continue the discussions with the AIAW. I urge the adoption of this resolution.

John Coyles (Pennsylvania State University): There is No. 327-1. I guess that was overlooked. I move the approval of No. 327-1. Stated as simply as possible, this does two things, it seems to us, a little differently than the original proposal.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the second "WHEREAS" in 327-1, it indicates "It is in the interest of the member colleges and universities of each organization that there be such a proposed plan." Right below that, it says, that the NCAA in conjunction with the AIAW establish a committee on women's intercollegiate athletics to be composed of nine persons who are faculty representatives from institutions belonging to both the NCAA and the AIAW. That is the first important difference, that they do it in conjunction with each other.

The second important difference is in the last paragraph, the last two lines, that steps be taken to provide for the successful merger of the two organizations. The rationale, I think, is relatively simple for this.

First of all, it seems only fair that the committee be appointed by both groups and that the rules that we are concerned about will work themselves out if the two organizations are successfully merged together. I think that it should also be pointed out that institutions like Penn State find themselves in a situation where you have, in effect, faculty representatives to both groups and sometimes the representatives of these two groups have different opinions.

It seems to be in the best interest of the colleges and universities that it be one organization to represent both.

President Fuzak: We are speaking to the one, the substitute or the amendment to the amendment labeled No. 327-1.

Mr. Betz: As a point of clarification, when I indicated the proposed amendment had been suggested, I was not referring to this one, but referring to another which really does nothing to change the content of No. 327.

This specifically changes the content by eliminating an NCAA committee and making one committee of two organizations. The original

No. 327, the one which would call for the continuation of a subcommittee but making a total committee, permanent committee of the NCAA, would be changed by eliminating the right or the practicality of the NCAA having its own committee on intercollegiate athletics for women but cooperating with the AIAW. They agreed with this approach.

Celeste Ulrich (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): I would, first of all, like to speak to a point of personal privilege. Sincerely, I would want you to know that, personally, I extend to you and to the NCAA Council my professional gratitude for your concern about student-athletes, both male and female, and I also am very appreciative of the opportunity to interact with this group in terms of your ideal regarding sports.

Regarding the Resolution No. 327-1, which has just been presented, I am in full agreement that No. 327, the original resolution, supports the very things that we have just approved. No. 327-1 does not do that so, therefore, I shall be forced not to support it. I am not favoring No. 327-1 because I think that this resolution, first of all, by the NCAA, suggests there be a committee or insists there be a committee that is composed of two organizations. I don't think we have the jurisdiction to tell another organization what they should do.

The second thing that I would like to suggest, and to which I take issue, is that being provided for or suggested by 327-1 is to provide a successful merger of the two organizations. I do not believe we are at this point where we can direct a committee to take that step.

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): I speak not in opposition to this resolution. I was not going to speak in opposition to No. 326, but I am expressing the strong sentiment and point of view that emanated from Division II Round Table discussions. I speak also as a Division II representative on the Executive Committee as well as my own institution, Springfield College.

President Fuzak: Ed, I am sorry. Again, you are going to be unhappy with me, but I am going to ask you to speak just to the motion which is No. 327-1. I will guarantee you recognition as soon as we have disposed of it.

Robert Strimer (Ohio Wesleyan University): I am a member of the joint committee of the NCAA and the AIAW. I speak in opposition to No. 327-1. I agree wholeheartedly with what Celeste has said. I think it is time, regardless of what happens, whether we give a joint type of competition to women's sports or whatever method it takes; but I think it is essential at this time that we do have a standing committee of the NCAA.

I am speaking in opposition, because of the fact it lists for the first time that I know of in a committee such as this the exclusive right of the faculty representatives to be on this particular committee. I would hope that all those who might be appointed to this committee might be either athletic directors or faculty representatives on the basis of their experience and what they can give to this particular committee.

[Proposal No. 327-1 (page A-138) was defeated.]

Mr. Steitz: I will not repeat the remarks I made earlier. My humble

opinion is that the NCAA has the moral and legal responsibility to provide competition for women for its members. Our institution happens to be a chartered member of the AIAW. We have hosted the AIAW championship events and participated in its tournaments. I am proud of the fact that our institution has played a significant role in the growth of this fine organization. We are not arguing against the AIAW competitions, but are seeking additional arenas of competition for the NCAA membership, especially those members of the NCAA who are not members of the AIAW.

I have heard the remark we don't want to set up programs that are in competition with each other. I personally do not prescribe to that thesis. This very organization's growth and strength has been based upon competition and free enterprise. The choice of women's competition should be left to the institutions.

If we enter into AIAW, NAIA, AAU or the NCAA competition, I subscribe to the belief that the rules of that organization for its competition should prevail; but allow the institution to make the determination of what competition it cares to enter into. I do not believe the conduct or management of the national championships is the sole province of any organization, be it for males or females.

I respectfully request that the Council in good faith consider this proposal and do all it can to start these championships with the 1977-78 season.

William Exum (Kentucky State University): I don't wish to prolong this discussion. I do, however, think this is important. I am in agreement with what Ed Steitz said. I think from my previous discussions—I was on the Council going back two years—it is now time this be done as fast and as quickly as possible to give the institutions a chance to decide whether or not they wish to compete in AIAW or NCAA competitions.

I think that is a duty that is owed this membership regardless of anything else. Our students, who are women, whether AIAW or not, are under the NCAA obligations. As such, they need a chance to compete in championships under the NCAA sponsorship.

President Fuzak: I am sorry it is so difficult to decide whether it relates or doesn't relate. If it is under the instructions to the committee, it may seem to; but as a matter of fact, we are talking about a resolution which establishes a permanent committee and a subcommittee. Let's hold it to that.

Edward Markey (Saint Michael's College): I find it very difficult and frustrating for a small school such as ours, which recently has gotten into the male-female programs—the female programs only having started four years ago—to find that our organization has not been able to come up with some program to properly implement the athletic and recreational, particularly the competitive athletic needs of women.

If this proposal is, in effect, going to initiate that step forward, I would certainly subscribe and recommend that we do something in this regard to get it started. I would certainly hope that we could get some approval on this legislation.

Stanley Marshall (NCAA Secretary-Treasurer, South Dakota State University): I would appreciate an opportunity to make a quick comment that is germane to this resolution; and I would state as fol-

lows: the number one purpose in the Manual of this Association reads as follows, "To initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletic programs for student-athletes and promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, sports participation as a recreational pursuit and athletic excellence. To uphold the principle of institutional control of, and responsibility for, all intercollegiate sports in conformity with the Constitution and Bylaws of this Association."

I will not go further. My point is that I firmly agree with Mr. Exum, Mr. Steitz, that the National Collegiate Athletic Association is not for men, not for women and should begin as quickly as possible to move toward the offering of national championships so that institutions have an opportunity to make a choice as to where they want to place their program. We have been negligent. This should have been done, in my opinion, many, many years ago.

[Proposal No. 327 (page A-129) was approved.]

President Fuzak: I should like to request of the body approval of the change of order, and it is particularly significant because we are in court on a given case. I think our legal counsel says to be sure and get this one in. It is No. 275. Would someone move the approval of changing the order, so that we may take up No. 275 at this time?

Amateurism—Agents

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): I move we change the order at this time so we may consider Proposal No. 275.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Mr. Marshall: I move approval of No. 275.

[The motion was seconded.]

Very quickly, our legal counsel advises that this sort of language will assist us greatly in enforcing the rules we have on the books and in treating student-athletes fairly in terms of advisement and in terms of agents. It is consistent with the rest of our sports professional rules.

[Proposal No. 275 (page A-115) was approved.]

Resolution: Athletic Insurance

Louis McCullough (Iowa State University): There is one I think that a great many people would like to discuss and that is Proposal No. 302, the resolution on athletic insurance. Therefore, I move to change the order to bring up No. 302 at this time.

[The motion was seconded and approved, 162-72.]

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I would like to move adoption of No. 302 on behalf of the member institutions listed.

[The motion was seconded.]

This authorizes the NCAA Council to prepare a comprehensive report and plan as to a paid basic athletic insurance program for the member institutions in those sports that are sponsored by the NCAA and to report that plan back to the next Convention.

The payment for that plan of a basic athletic insurance program would be taken from assessments made just as the NCAA makes assessments now on the football and television receipts. With the approval of this plan, it obviously would be turned over to the

Council to study; and if adopted at the next Convention, I would expect a series of options as to deductibles, et cetera, that it could consider, with appropriate bid information and costs to pass judgment on this next January. This is an approach that I think by collectively pooling the effects of over 700 institutions we could do something for all members of the Association, no matter how small that might be on many campuses.

Homer Rice (University of North Carolina): As a member of the Television Committee, I wish to speak in opposition to this Proposal No. 302. I think it is very important that our membership understands how the money is being used that is assessed, the NCAA-TV monies.

There are several things. I will just list a few of them. First of all, the postgraduate scholarships, the NCAA Statistics Service and we aided in making possible the new headquarters in Mission, Kansas. We pay some of the Association's legal fees. We aid in the promotional programs which stress topics that are of interest to all colleges and finance many of the championship events in that category.

Next year, the increase in revenue that has been afforded us through our negotiating committee's good efforts, has gone to funds toward team travel to championship events. It provides money to guarantee team expenses in our championships, football championships in II and III. It financed expenses for the NCAA enforcement program that is being used. I would like to add these. If these services were taken away or added to for this one proposal, the members would have to pay for it some way, probably by more assessments in their dues some way.

Mr. Exum: As a member of Division II, I must agree with the previous speaker. I am in opposition to this. I think those members who are in the round table discussions in Division II were in opposition to it, also. I think that to endanger the benefits we have from the TV assessment, football assessment, is something that certainly I don't wish to happen in Division II. I don't believe Division II members want it to happen.

Another thing, I believe this kind of proposal will be actually rewarding individual institutions for carrying on very poor medical provisions or medical aid to their athletes. A third and final one, and I mean no flippancy by this remark, but certainly it seems that Mr. and Mrs. Robin Hood want to join Medicare or Medicaid. [Laughter]

James Jarrett (Old Dominion University): I want to speak in opposition to this amendment, also. I feel, first of all, this is not much different than the other proposal to distribute revenue to all the schools whether a part of the program or not.

Now, I am very, very much in support of the proposal that I understand is coming from the Television Plan, that revenue will be used to assist athletes in travel to championship events. They have earned this, and I think this is more important.

Mr. Marshall: I would hope that we could wait on this study. I am not opposed to a study. We are in the midst of a study right now to determine how much money we can move over into championships travel. I think another study piled on that would make both of them meaningless.

I feel very strongly that we are following the charge given us previously to try to do something in the area of championship travel for all institutions. We are in the midst of that project. We can't complete that one and put this one on top and do a decent job for the Association. I would urgently ask you to defeat the proposal.

Mr. Horn: Since this is being taken up so late on the agenda, it is a little difficult for a number of people who support it to be here. This was, I believe, endorsed by the Collegiate Commissioners Association in its meeting in Waterloo, Iowa this last summer.

We are talking about a study. I don't see how a parliamentary body can make a judgment on alternative expenditures unless they have information put before them. I must say with all due respect for some of the things we are talking about now, such as postgraduate scholarships, the fine young men that are now honored would get a scholarship almost anywhere in the United States. It is not really necessary for the NCAA to pay for that.

President Fuzak: The question has been called for. It is a common requirement. There has been a request that a correction be made. The Collegiate Commissioners did not support this. The Division II and III commissioners supported this. There is some difference in the name. The Collegiate Commissioners are Division I commissioners.

Richard Koppenhaver: Since I am responsible for the minutes of the group, I will have to disagree with Dr. Horn. We did not endorse that program. Our proposal, which we agreed to, was to ask the Insurance Committee of the NCAA to examine this. We do not endorse this plan.

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): As chairman of Division II Steering Committee, I would like to state that we did not discuss No. 302 in our round table. It had adjourned before we got to it. I do that for the benefit of my good friend, Bill Exum. I would like to vote this proposition down. As a Council member, I feel it is our obligation to take the welfare of the student-athletes in mind. Therefore, at the Council meeting this evening, if this is defeated, I would propose that the NCAA have a study on accident, medical injuries, as this pertains, but not the method of funding through the TV Plan.

President Fuzak: In other words, you are saying, vote it down. By the way, there is no Council meeting this evening. There is one tomorrow morning, however.

Paul Dietzel (Ohio Valley Conference): I would like to back up what our secretary of the College Divisions Commissioners Association has said. Since I am the vice-president of this association, I should like to state we did discuss this and it was strictly put forward as something to look into. It was not endorsed by the commissioners of Division II or Division III.

[Proposal No. 302 (page A-118) was defeated.]

Mr. Horn: Just as a matter of personal privilege, I should like to read from the Commissioner's Association summer meeting. It states, "Motion by Whitlaw, seconded by Hinga, that Dick Koppenhaver requests the NCAA Council to consider designating a certain percentage of the football-television money to be utilized to providing insurance coverage . . . to all NCAA member institutions,

and from that same fund a portion to be spent for the promotion of the intercollegiate athletics and a certain portion to be designated to reimburse the host institutions for deficits which might be incurred in administering NCAA postseason championships tournaments." This motion was approved. That is from the minutes of July 19-20, 1975.

President Fuzak: I am glad you clarified it. I suspect we have differences in semantics.

Mr. Koppenhaver: I would like to read from the resolution. It says in all NCAA sponsored sports.

President Fuzak: I don't think that is one we ought to dwell on. Let's go on. The next one is No. 242.

Transfer of Membership

William Nester (University of Cincinnati): In view of Louisville's having to leave, I would like to move adoption of No. 242.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 242 (page A-104) was approved by all three divisions.]

Eligibility—2.000 Rule

Thomas Fahy (Seton Hall University): On behalf of Seton Hall, we move the adoption of No. 243.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to speak briefly on the subject. The rule, of course, has been subject to great controversy over the years it has been in effect. I would like to give you a few of the reasons why we think it is a bad rule. First of all, we think it is discriminatory, at least in our area as to minorities. It is not meant to be that way, but as it turned out, it almost invariably gets applied against people, either black or Puerto Rican origin.

Secondly, it is discriminatory, I think, between the various divisions of the NCAA in that it only affects Division I. There are valid reasons for having different rules in different divisions, which I have learned in the days I have sat here. It doesn't seem to make any sense to me to say that it is all right for a student to go to one school under one set of circumstances and play basketball, and go to a school under the same set of circumstances and not be eligible to play basketball, especially in view of the fact that some of these Division II and Division III schools are very prestigious schools. I wish our own schools were as good as they were.

Thirdly, it is a very difficult thing to regulate. If you look to the next two amendments regarding 2.000 rule, it is as complicated a thing that has ever been written. It is a lawyer's delight, and I have found from my personal institution's expense.

Finally, there has been great talk about saving legal fees. I happen to regret that motion failed this morning. One of the great sources of the legal expenses of the NCAA in recent years has been with regard to this 2.000 rule. If you are looking for a pragmatic way of achieving what was not achieved by legislation this morning, I suggest that this is one to do it.

I would just take another couple of seconds of your time to exercise what appears to be a personal prerogative and make an additional statement. I have had some very difficult dealings with the NCAA in the last year or so; but as President Horn did yesterday,

I would like to pay tribute and respect to the Officers, the committees and the Council of the NCAA for their integrity and fairness.

President Fuzak: Father, there may be some confusion in terms of legal problems. We have had only one case in connection with the 2.00 rule. The others were in connection with 1.6.

Msgr. Fahy: All right, it is the same. I accept that correction. I am quite aware of that.

[Proposal No. 243 (page A-104) was defeated by Division I.]

Eligibility—2.000 Rule

Harry Cross (University of Washington): I move adoption of No. 244.

[The motion was seconded.]

We have some sympathy for Seton Hall's remarks, but we feel this is some sort of academic standard. We feel the 2.000 rule is a miserable one. It is a nuisance to work with. On the other hand, all of us know the difficulties of getting the reports in high schools.

We propose as an alternative, not a substitute but an alternative, for the qualifications to be very modest. That is, while there are institutions that must establish at least 12 units, that is 80 per cent of the normal load for averaging of the quarters.

You are not required to have even this modest progress rule. You can work the present 2.000 rule if you wish. If you have a progress rule that is modest, you can use it rather than the 2.000 rule. That is the essence of this proposal.

Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Does this mean if a student comes into our institution and we have a progress rule like this, he may compete in the first semester or first quarter while he has not yet established what his academic average will be?

Mr. Cross: That is correct.

[Proposal No. 244 (page A-104) was defeated by Division I.]

Eligibility—2.000 Rule

Orville Nothdurft (Bradley University): On behalf of the Missouri Valley Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 245, amending Article 4, Section 1-(j), Section 6-(b)-(1) and O.I. 400 following Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(1) and O.I. 401.

[The motion was seconded.]

The package of four changes in the existing 2.000 rule would remove the responsibility of determining an individual's eligibility for practice, competition, and financial aid from the high school and place that responsibility with the registrar of the member institution attendant.

Further, this legislation package directs the NCAA Council to develop and to distribute common tables for use by registrars to convert high school grading systems utilized which are not their traditional 4.0 system. Should a high school utilize a system not included in the conversion tables, such cases would be judged by the NCAA Committee on Academic Testing and requirements for certification, the same as provided for in existing legislation.

I believe all of us, as Mr. Cross stated, have had numerous periods of major frustration in our attempting to gain adequate information from high schools. I also think you can quickly recognize most of

these problems would be eliminated with the adoption of this proposal. At the same time, adequate uniformity nationally is provided. [Proposal No. 245 (page A-105) was defeated by Division I.]

Waivers

Ed Betz (University of the Pacific): I move adoption of Amendment No. 246.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment would remove from the privilege of the Council to waive the residence requirement when the students are involved in litigation of 4-6-(b) or the 2,000 rule. It would seem inappropriate to waive the residence requirement for a student who should not have had his initial residence when he transferred, when the same privilege is not afforded to a student who has met the 2,000 rule.

[Proposal No. 246 (page A-107) was approved by all three divisions.]

Institutional Eligibility

Ernest Casale (Temple University): I would like to move Proposal No. 247 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this amendment is to consolidate into Bylaw 4-1 by reference in Bylaw 4-6-(b) the like provisions of Sections 1 and 6-(b) applicable to Division I, thereby simplifying the existing requirements for the reader, and to set forth in Section 6-(b) the two differences between the two sections.

[Proposal No. 247 (page A-107) was approved by Division I.]

Eligibility for Championships

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of No. 248.

[The motion was seconded and Proposal No. 248 (page A-107) was approved by all three divisions.]

Institutional Eligibility

Mr. Betz: I move adoption of No. 249.

[The motion was seconded.]

This, again, refers to the eligibility rule. It is for Nos. 220 and 221 which have previously been adopted. This would require that a student-athlete in Division II schools applying for Division I membership have to be in conformity with the 2,000 rule for two years before they can be considered for Division I membership. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 249 (page A-108) was approved by Division I.]

Institutional Eligibility

John Eiler (East Stroudsburg State College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 250.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent and purpose of this No. 250 is to permit exempt Division II institutions to utilize Division I campus visit limitations, as well as Division I limitations on awards. Now, without Proposal No. 250, a Division II institution would have little opportunity ever to achieve the program quality to move to Division I, because it would be un-

able to recruit and aid at the same time and rate as the current members of this division. I urge your adoption of this proposal. **Olav Kollevoll** (Lafayette College): No. 250-1 is to change the effective date immediately. I so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 250-1 states that immediately, for declaration of intent filed prior to February 1, 1976 and thereafter effective August 1, for declarations of intent filed prior to June 1 of the same year. If this were to pass, this would mean that we could have our 95 in football visitations permitted this year, rather than wait a year.

[Proposals No. 250-1 (page A-137) and No. 250 (page A-109) were approved by Division II.]

Institutional Eligibility

Mr. Eiler: I move adoption of Proposal No. 251.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 251 deals only with those sports such as fencing, ice hockey, skiing, indoor track, volleyball, water polo, in which the Association sponsors a single championship to which each member institution is eligible. A member of Division II is covered by more restrictive aid limitation than a member of Division I. Yet, Bylaw 4-6-(f) states if a Division II member exceeds the Division I limit in the sport, the institution is ineligible for NCAA-sponsored competition in that sport. Obviously, this places the Division II member at a disadvantage. No. 251 lets Division No. II institutions apply the Division I limits in the single championship sport and only attempts to be competitive with Division I institutions which it will be playing.

This proposal relates to the effective date of August 1 for the new Division II financial aid limits. Ice hockey, for example, if No. 251 does not pass on August 1, a Division II member may award the coming academic year 15 grants in ice hockey, while Division I members will be able to award 20.

[Proposal No. 251 (page A-109) was approved by Division II.]

[Proposals No. 252 (page A-110) and No. 252-1 (page A-137) were not introduced.]

Transfer Rules

Al Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): On behalf of the Southwest Athletic Conference, I should like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 253.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this rule is to ameliorate what appears to be a possible inequity to certain student-athletes as a result of certain major rule changes the Convention has adopted in the last year or two.

Specifically, the Convention has discarded the four-year grant and adopted the one-year grant, and also has adopted squad limitations. It is possible under those circumstances that, it would seem, for certain student-athletes to have their scholarships terminated.

It is possible, at least we believe, they can transfer to another school and immediately participate, and thus should not be under those circumstances subject to the normal one-year residency requirement. At least, that is our intention not to encourage or even have anything to do with run-off problems or other things concern-

ing the members. We think it is a fair and logical amendment as a result of these rule changes.

Louis Myers (University of Arizona): The NCAA Council took no formal position with respect to this proposal. However, they have asked me, as chairman of the Eligibility Committee, to express some concern over its provision.

First of all, I should like to point out that this proposed waiver of residence requirement would apply only to the student-athlete who received aid at the original institution. The student-athlete who did not receive aid, that is the original institution, would not have an advantage of this waiver. I feel this is an inconsistent application of the same rule. Further, I feel that the original requirement of a one-year residency does help to establish the fact that the student-athlete is a representative member of the student body. The amendment is a further erosion of the transfer rule, I believe.

Mr. Witte: I recognize this isn't as exciting an issue at this time as some that we have been through. I don't like to prolong the agony we are all sharing. First of all, I don't like to be zapped by a Council position in which they don't oppose us, they just express concern. If they are going to oppose it, I wish they would say so.

Secondly, the attitude that we have to resolve every conceivable inequity before we can resolve some is a little stringent standard for me to live by. We thought we were doing something good for at least some people who are otherwise going to be deprived of financial aid for no fault of their own. I am not entirely sure whether the objection raised by the gentleman from the Council expressing concern is even germane.

Mickey Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): I rise to support this proposal and very vigorously. From a practical experience standpoint, we have one institution currently in litigation regarding the withdrawal of financial aid. It was done in proper order, incidentally. The attorneys on both sides have indicated that quite probably this case wouldn't have progressed to the point it has today had there been an alternative available of an unrestricted nature to that young man in the transfer situation. Had he been able to transfer from his institution to another four-year institution and be immediately eligible, he would not have, quite probably, brought this case into litigation. From a practical experience, we would urge your support for this particular amendment.

[Proposal No. 253 (page A-110) was defeated by all three divisions.]

[Proposal No. 253-1 (page A-137) was not introduced.]

[Proposal No. 254 (page A-110) was withdrawn.]

Transfer Rules

James Hawkins (Fort Valley State College): I move, on behalf of the Council, No. 255.

[The motion was seconded.]

Quickly, because I know we are all in 2,000 hurries, this will explain and make legal the fact that one enters a four-year college, moves and transfers to a junior college and returns to the four-year college that he left, it would make it legal when he left the four-year college if he had no unfulfilled problems there, and when he

returned he would be legal. If he had any unfulfilled problems, he would have to fulfill them first, and then he would become legal. This is only if he returned from the junior college to the four-year college that he transferred from.

[Proposal No. 255 (page A-111) was approved by all three divisions.]

Eligibility

Harry Cross (University of Washington): I move approval of No. 256.

[The motion was seconded.]

I now move approval of No. 256-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I will speak to the amendment aspect. The last line has the unfortunate circumstance of suggesting that a student-athlete has direct recourse to the NCAA contrary to the Council position that its member institutions are the ones that seek relief in behalf of their student-athletes. O.I. 18, which relates to all these eligibility rules, adequately provides for that appeal process. I urge and suggest the deletion of that last sentence in No. 256-1.

Doug Weaver (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): I would like to speak to the amendment. I think No. 256 is bad enough, but 256-1 is unconscionable to take away the appeal process.

Mr. Cross: The substance of No. 256 is not to take it away. It is, rather, to put it in the pattern of all appeals.

[Proposal No. 256-1 (page A-137) was approved.]

The main motion, the intent is clear enough. A student is not permitted more than five visits. If that occurs, the liability falls on him as I think it should. It is his obligation to notify those that invite him to the institutions.

Mr. Weaver: This failed last year, and I know that the body remembers why. It failed basically because it is the most severe sanction available. There is no criteria put on somebody who is to come under the NCAA umbrella. We have to be careful about these.

[Proposal No. 256 (page A-111) was defeated, 123-80 failed to achieve two-thirds majority.]

Individual Eligibility

Mr. Hawkins: On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 257.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 257 would clarify to make eligible for NCAA championships teams from colleges that were on different plans instead of the regular plan, for example, a plan of four-one-four. This would make them eligible if the college certified these students were taking full loads.

This would be, if you are the member of that allied conference, then the conference would carry this, would supervise this. If you are not a member and involved in a conference, then the regular NCAA program would supervise it, the Eligibility Committee.

[Proposal No. 257 (page A-112) was approved by all three divisions.]

Individual Eligibility

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): I move adoption of No. 258.
[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this one is to clarify a technicality. This would waive the 12-credit requirement in the last term of a degree program. If a student had five credits to get, he could register for all the five and save himself time and the institution.

We remember a technicality in the student who was in his seventh semester as the last semester, an accelerated program. We have not had a ruling from Warren Brown that this was not permissible. All we are doing here is to eliminate the numbers of the last semester, eight or 12, and make it the final semester, which is what I think was the intent of the Convention last year.

[Proposal No. 258 (page A-112) was approved by all three divisions.]

President Fuzak: I am going to call on our Secretary-Treasurer Stan Marshall, who, in behalf of the Officers, is going to propose a kind of package moving up of issues we think are critical.

Mr. Marshall: In order to facilitate the operation of the Association in the coming year, I move that we move directly to No. 272, proceed then to No. 290 and to No. 293.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): Can I amend that to tack on No. 263 at the end after you have finished those?

President Fuzak: We will accept that, so it will be four there.

C. D. Henry (Big Ten Conference): How about No. 271?

President Fuzak: That is the problem. Once we start doing that, we get them all. I think these are ones that the Officers made a judgment were significant to the body in general. If everybody adds one, there is no sense in doing it. Let's vote on the motion as we have it, and then we will let you make that motion after we dispose of these, C.D.

We will not tack yours on, Jim, in justice. We might be criticized for that. There will only be three. Let me read them again. They are Nos. 272, 290 and 293.

[The motion was approved.]

Postseason Football Contests

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 272.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to go through the changes of this. First, it establishes the period of August 1 to the conclusion of the football game on the third Saturday in November or 6 p.m., whichever is earlier. During that period, only an institution and all the representatives stated there in paragraph (j) shall not initiate contact specifically to discuss the possibility of its team or team's participation in such game.

It also provides that the bowl shall not discuss such possibility with those representatives. It does not in any way preclude bowl committees from visiting institutions' games or participation in review for their decision making.

President Fuzak: The parliamentarian has informed me he has ruled one paragraph to be out of order. If you will look at the second

part of paragraph (2), it has quotes around it saying, "The management of the certified game which violates the provisions of this paragraph shall return to the Association 50 per cent of its share of gross receipts," et cetera. The parliamentarian rules that out of order. Unless you move to divide, the whole thing will be out of order, Bob.

Mr. James: I am sorry. I missed that. I move to divide, and I understand that it has been ruled out of order.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 272 (page A-114) was approved by all three divisions.]

Amendments

Ed Betz (University of the Pacific): I move adoption of No. 290.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment will relieve the national office of the tremendous load in terms of receiving amendments and provide for equity in that wire transmissions will arrive on November 1. Those coming through the mail should be post marked October 25. Hopefully, they will also arrive by November 1.

[Proposal No. 290 (page A-116) was approved.]

Extra Events Committee

Robert Strimer (Ohio Wesleyan University): In behalf of the Council, I would like to propose No. 293 for adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is obvious this is bringing the extra event more in line with district representation.

[Proposal No. 293 (page A-117) was approved by all three divisions.]

Mr. Henry: I would like to move that we take out of order and consider Nos. 263, 271 and 273.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Academic Standards

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I would like to move adoption of No. 263.

[The motion was seconded.]

Very briefly, much time and thought at this Convention has been devoted to legislation intended to make maximum use of dollars spent by our institutions for our programs, and we are very proud to say that we are confident they have a major impact on the total educational experience for the young men.

My first point, and again briefly, is to emphasize that our primary consideration thus far has gone into institutional interests and I have no quarrel with that, except I do hope we can give favorable consideration to this proposal on behalf of the students, which would deal with making maximum use of the student's dollar and the student's time during the five years which we say in our rules a student is eligible for athletics.

We know that large numbers of our students, including athletes, go into professions and business programs which require a graduate degree. Increasing numbers of these students have been obliged to move as rapidly as they can to complete their undergraduate require-

ments and to get into graduate school as quickly as possible, both in the interest of the dollars involved and the time involved.

Most graduate schools require a bachelor's degree. Proposal No. 263 will not extend eligibility beyond the four years he presently has. He must attend the same institution. He must be within the five-year period. It will take a Constitutional two-thirds. I hope you can support it.

Henry Lowe (University of Missouri, Columbia): Most of this matter has been before the Association before. We support it and think it is good for the student. We think it is time that this Association acted favorably on this matter.

Mickey Holmes: (Missouri Valley Conference): Well, obviously, we support this amendment, we in the Missouri Valley Conference; or we would not have joined in sponsorship of it. I will not reiterate many of the things that Ross Smith has said, except to point out that this proposal merely allows a student-athlete to continue his academic progress in an orderly program manner and still compete, if that eligibility remains under the five-year rule. The thing I would like to ask in requesting your support of this measure is, after all, aren't we still very much in the education business?

[Proposal No. 263 (page A-113) was defeated, 106-71; failed to gain a two-thirds majority.]

President Fuzak: I intend to hold to the announced adjournment time of 5 p.m. We must have committee reports, or otherwise we are likely to be without Officers this next year. Someone is applauding that thought. [Laughter] We will have to stop and take up the report of the Nominating Committee, which has been distributed to you, and the Committee on Committees.

The Committee on Committees has reported and distributed its list.

Out-of-Season Filming

C. D. Henry (Big Ten Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 271.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is clearly stated. This is to allow the NCAA Promotion Committee to permit member institutions to allow teams to participate in filming sessions for Official NCAA Films or approved promotional programs. I urge its support.

[Proposal No. 271 (page A-113) was approved by all three divisions.]

Postseason Football Contests

Andrew Brown (Southwestern Athletic Conference): As you know, Convention members and delegates, this year we are celebrating our Bicentennial. Our nation has been in existence for 200 years, and we feel we should be able to celebrate this event properly.

Our school has spent two years in preparing for this event and would like permission in order to host a Bicentennial game. The Southwest Athletic Conference would like to host a 1976 Bicentennial Bowl. The success of this bowl will accomplish four goals. First, enhance the advisability of the Bicentennial celebration. Secondly, demonstrate to the world that all things are possible through athletics. Thirdly, financially assist the black institutions of the conference to remain institutions of higher education; and fourth, it

will give to America the new gift of rededication that all men are created equal and America is the land of the free.

We are proposing this bowl to provide the Southwest Athletic Conference an opportunity to participate in the two postseason games. It will afford these institutions an opportunity to display that. We have received several endorsements already. I urge your support of this amendment.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): On behalf of the Extra Events Committee, we request nonsupport of this.

President Fuzak: The Extra Events Committee indicates opposition to it.

Mr. Brown: Could Bob share with me the objections? I want to share this with the Convention. I have been working on this proposal for two years. I started back in 1973. I have given this Extra Events Committee all the information. I have sent a detailed proposal to the Council, and they referred it back to the Convention.

No reason was given why this game should not take place. I should like to point out that athletics has been a tremendous gift to the American society. We have made more progress by athletic competition than any other method of black racial progress. We have not been able to achieve that through any other source.

Now, what this will do, we are proposing the champion of the Southwest Athletic Conference play one of the service academies of the country. We think it is only fitting that this be afforded the free, black institutions of America which their forefathers have done so much to make the country great. Why deny us this opportunity? I don't see any reason why it should not take place. Again, I solicit your support.

Mr. James: Just to answer his question, it is not limited to one game.

Mr. Brown: It is limited for one year. It says it would only take place during the Bicentennial year. That is what the proposal says.

Mr. James: But until we come in and get the bowl certified in the same year, it is already going against our policies. Now, how can we deny others the same opportunity?

Mr. Brown: That is why I am bringing it to the floor.

Mr. James: I recognize that. That is what is compelling me to bring the same objections to the floor.

[Proposal No. 273 (page A-115) was approved by Division II, 24-11, and by Division III; defeated by Division I.]

Mr. Brown: What does that mean?

President Fuzak: It means it is available to Division II and Division III, but not Division I.

Mr. Brown: I would like to make one closing remark.

President Fuzak: Please, we are running out of time.

Mr. Brown: It will be short. I just want to say the Southwestern Athletic Conference and I, Andy Brown, not speaking for the conference, will become the black conscience of the NCAA and make certain that all these proposals will be given due consideration.

James Pacy (University of Vermont): I would like to ask this body, before we conclude, that we deal with No. 286, dealing with Robert's Rules of Order. Let's pin it down for the future, so we will have only one source. This should not take long to deal with that.

President Fuzak: I have made a commitment to adjourn at 5 p.m., and we must have the report of the Nominating Committee.

Mr. Pacy: May I appeal to the chair?

President Fuzak: You must have a two-thirds vote to change the order in that effect.

Mr. Pacy: Yes, I so move.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Fuzak: You have committed me to going beyond 5 p.m. so I guess you will have to relieve me of my promise.

Organizations—Meetings

Celeste Ulrich (North Carolina University, Greensboro): I move adoption of Proposal No. 286.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move we adopt Proposal No. 286-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

May I explain how we were requested to reword the amendment by the Council. We were glad to do that to expedite the passage of this particular motion.

[Proposals No. 286-1 (page A-138) and No. 286 (page A-116) were approved.]

Ed Betz (University of the Pacific): While we are operating under Robert's Rules of Order, I move that we suspend the rules and take up the nominations that have been made.

President Fuzak: I must correct you, Ed. I thought we were operating under them with one slight exception of interpretation up to this point. But, at any rate, we are not operating specifically until the conclusion of this Convention.

Mr. Betz: I stand corrected. But any rules say that you may suspend the rules. Hence, whatever rules under which we are operating, I move that we suspend those rules and make the nominations the final action of this Convention so you can stick to your promise.

President Fuzak: Thank you very much. I guess I misinterpreted what you were leading up to.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

19. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): I move the report of the 1976 Committee on Committees be adopted.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

20. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the Nominating Committee, we wish to report to this Convention its nominations. I should first, however, like to say that on behalf of the Nominating Committee and on behalf of the Council, we want to express our appreciation to Professor Ralph Fadum of North Carolina State University and to Mr. Bill Orwig of Indiana University for their services on the Council. [Applause]

Now, to the report of the Nominating Committee, I should like to announce the nominations to you for the vice-president for District I, Ross H. Smith of MIT; District III, Charley Scott from the University of Alabama; District V, James Frank of Lincoln University, Missouri; District VII, Harry Troxell of Colorado State Uni-

versity; at-large vice-president, Cecil Coleman of the University of Illinois, Champaign.

For your Secretary-Treasurer, Stanley Marshall of South Dakota State University and for President, John A. Fuzak, Michigan State. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this recommendation by this Convention and the committee seconds it. All those in favor, please say *aye*; all opposed *no*; Let the record show they were elected unanimously.

[The Officers were extended a standing ovation.]

President Fuzak: It is a little bit like that Lincoln story about the man that was about to be ridden out of town on a rail, and he said if it wasn't for the honor of the thing, he'd just as soon decline.

[Laughter]

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I just would like to say in addition your re-election, I think all of us would like to congratulate you on the patience with which you presided over a very complicated Convention.

I would like to add in 15 seconds, although I realize the Council is overburdened with studies, that to ease future Conventions perhaps they would like to think in the interim of a codification of existing regulations and the thought of submitting pro and con statements on these proposals to the membership written by the author or if in opposition by the Council. I think that would be particularly helpful. If the noncontroversial items could be lumped together, I think we could waive those through in about 15 minutes and then settle down to the policy issues.

President Fuzak: Thank you. It will be helpful if you put that in writing and forward it to our office. Our meeting is adjourned.

[The Convention adjourned at 5:10 p.m.]

Appendix A

3rd SPECIAL CONVENTION LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1975-76 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated.]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 3rd SPECIAL CONVENTION

| <i>Proposal Numbers</i> | <i>General Topic</i> |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 through 18 | Tabled Proposals |
| 19 through 24 | Postponed Proposals |
| 25 through 28 | Limitations on Scouting |
| 29 through 67 | Playing and Practice Seasons |
| 68 through 70 | Income Distribution |
| 71 through 79 | Miscellaneous |

TABLED PROPOSALS

NO. 1 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f), page 8, as follows:

"(f) Financial aid, including a grant-in-aid which carries with it a partial work requirement, may be awarded for any term (semester or quarter) during which a student-athlete is in regular attendance, provided he is not under contract to or currently receiving compensation from a professional sports organization. **Unearned** financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the awarding institution and of that institution's conference, if any, and shall be limited to room, board and tuition. **All other aid received by a student-athlete up to the commonly accepted educational expenses defined below shall be based on financial need to be established by each institution's financial aids office through the use of the Parents' Confidential Statement.**"

Source: Eastern Illinois University.

Intent: To limit unearned financial aid to room, board and tuition and to specify that all other aid up to the amount permitted for "commonly accepted educational expenses" must be based on a showing of need by the recipient.

Effective Date: Immediately; for those student-athletes first entering member institutions and for all renewals of financial aid after the beginning fall term of the 1975-76 academic year.

Action: Not removed from table.

NO. 2 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b), page 32, as follows:

"(b) No athletic staff member or other representative of the institution's athletic interests shall contact a prospective student-athlete in person off campus for recruiting purposes (per O.I. 100) during the academic year until the prospect completes his junior year in high school. **Contacts off campus with prospects recruited for certain sports may occur only during specified periods as follows: Football—December 1 through the third Saturday in February; Basketball—February 15 through the second Saturday in April; Ice Hockey—February 15 through May 15.**"

Source: NCAA Council. (Amended by Big Ten Conference.)

Intent: To specify the period of time during which in person, off campus contacts in football, basketball and ice hockey shall be made.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Division I delegates to NCAA Meeting on Economy in Intercollegiate Athletics recommended off-campus contact period be limited in all sports to shortest workable time; Division II delegates recommended adoption of any recruiting legislation adopted by Division I member institutions, and Division III did not believe such restrictions were necessary. Special Committee on Length of Season concurred with specified time periods. NCAA Council concluded that sports other than the three identified should not be regulated because of minimal economic savings and recruiting practices in other sports are necessarily so varied that regulation would be difficult.]

Action: Not removed from table.

NO. 3 CAMPUS VISITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(c), page 36, as follows:

"(c) No member institution shall permit more than one expense-paid visit to its campus under the authorization of Bylaws 1-5-(a) and (b). A prospective student-athlete *may* shall not be provided an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of classes of his senior year in high school, **and such visit by a prospect recruited for a particular sport shall occur only during a specified period as follows: Football—October 15 through the first Saturday in February; Basketball—January 15 through the second Saturday in April; Other Sports—January 15 through the second Saturday in May.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify and limit by sport the period of time during which an institution may provide or permit a paid campus visit for a prospective student-athlete.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Divisional delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy in Intercollegiate Athletics considered this proposal, but did not make definite recommendations. Special Committee on Length of Season recommended period for such visits be December 1 through the candidate's declaration signing date for football, February 15 through the signing date for basketball, and March 15 through June 1 for other sports. NCAA Council concluded such visits should be permitted during a reasonably restricted period to be compatible with candidate's declaration program; also, to be effective even if the candidate's declaration program is not adopted.]

Action: Defeated by Divisions II and III and by Division I as amended (see Nos. 4, 5).

NO. 4 CAMPUS VISITATION

Amend Proposal No. 3; Bylaw 1-5-(c), as follows:

"(c) No member institution shall permit more than one expense-paid visit to its campus under the authorization of Bylaws 1-5-(a) and (b). A prospective student-athlete shall not be provided an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of classes of his senior year in high school, and such visit by a prospect recruited for a particular sport shall **not occur only during a specified period as follows after the following dates: Football—October 15 through the first Saturday in February; Basketball—January 15 through the second Saturday in April; Other Sports—January 15 through the second Saturday in May June.**"

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I; defeated by Division II, 39-64, and by Division III.

NO. 5 CAMPUS VISITATION

Amend Proposal No. 3; Bylaw 1-5-(c), as follows:

"(c) No member institution shall permit more than one expense-paid visit to its campus under the authorization of Bylaws 1-5-(a) and (b). A prospective student-athlete shall not be provided an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of classes of his senior year in high school, and such visit by a prospect recruited for a particular sport shall occur only during a specified period as follows: Football—October 15 through the *first third* Saturday in February; Basketball—January 15 through the second Saturday in April; Other Sports—January 15 through the second Saturday in May."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by Division I; defeated by Division II, 61-66, and by Division III.

NO. 6 RECRUITING AIDS

Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 105, following Bylaw 1-1-(a), page 32, renumbering subsequent O.I.'s, as follows:

"O.I. 105. Only those materials normally distributed to all prospective students by the institution's admissions office may be sent to a prospective student-athlete. Recruiting aids including, but not limited to, photographs, films, slides, brochures, calendars, magazines and programs shall be restricted to on-campus use only. Off-campus use of such aids shall be an improper inducement."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To prohibit the off-campus distribution of high-cost recruiting aids.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Motion to remove from the table defeated.

NO. 7 RECRUITING AIDS

Amend Proposal No. 6; new O.I. 105, as follows:

"O.I. 105. Only those materials normally distributed to all prospective students by the institution's admissions office may be sent to a prospective student-athlete. The use of recruiting aids shall be limited to those aids and procedures normally used by admissions office personnel in the admission process. Recruiting aids including, but not limited to, photographs, films, slides, brochures, calendars, and magazines and programs shall be restricted to on-campus use only. Off-campus use of such aids shall be an improper inducement. The distribution of materials outlining only the regulations governing the recruitment of student-athletes is permissible."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 6.

NO. 8 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Add a new Bylaw 12, Personnel and Squad Limitations, following page 92; to read as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"Section 2. Basketball Coaching Staff. No member institution may employ more than two persons on its athletic staff whose primary purpose is the organization and coaching of its intercollegiate basketball program. Off-campus recruiting is restricted to those two designated staff members. One part-time coach may be employed who shall be restricted to on-campus recruiting and whose compensation shall be limited to, and in the form of, a scholarship or grant-in-aid not to exceed accepted educational expenses at that institution.

"Section 3. Coaching Staff in Sports Other Than Football and Basketball. No member institution may employ more than one person on its athletic staff whose primary purpose is the organization and coaching of any one of its sports programs other than football and basketball. Off-campus recruiting is restricted to that designated staff member in each such sport. In addition, one part-time assistant may be employed for each such sport, and they shall be restricted to on-campus recruiting. Their

compensation may be the equivalent of a full scholarship or grant-in-aid or, in the case of a conference member, the equivalent of the highest cost of a scholarship or grant-in-aid within that conference.

"O.I. 1200. For purposes of this legislation, a staff member who serves in a dual or multiple coaching capacity shall be counted in each sport involved."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To limit the number of coaches a member institution may employ and to restrict off-campus recruitment to certain designated coaching personnel.

Effective Date: Immediately, for restriction of off-campus recruiting to the number of designated persons specified; September 1, 1977, for reduction of number of coaches employed.

Action: Not removed from table.

NO. 9 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Add a new Bylaw 12, Personnel and Squad Limitations, following page 92; Section 1 to read as follows:

"Section 1. Number of Coaches. A member institution shall not employ or otherwise utilize the services of coaches in excess of the following numbers:

"(a) Baseball, Ice Hockey, Swimming/Water Polo, Cross Country/Track. Two coaches in each sport or combination of sports, either full-time or part-time.

"(b) Soccer, Lacrosse, Gymnastics, Wrestling. Two coaches in each sport, of which no more than one may be a full-time coach.

"(c) Fencing, Golf, Skiing, Tennis, Volleyball. One coach in each sport, either full-time or part-time.

"(d) A multiple sport coach (i.e., one who serves in more than one sport) shall be counted in these limitations as follows: A coach in football and one or more other sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football. A coach in basketball and one or more other sports (other than football) shall be counted in the sport of basketball. A coach in two or more sports other than football or basketball shall be counted in one of the sports but need not be counted in the other.

"(e) No individual other than those specified in the applicable paragraph above may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution during any game, practice or other organized activity in the sports listed, except that a member institution may permit an uncompensated volunteer to participate in such coaching provided no more than one such person is involved in a sport, he receives no compensation or remuneration of any sort, including expenses, from the institution and he is not permitted to recruit off campus; further, a member institution may permit undergraduate student-athletes who have completed their eligibility to participate in such coaching provided they are completing the requirements for their baccalaureate degree, they remain full-time students in the institution, they receive no compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution

other than the financial aid they received as student-athletes and they are not permitted to recruit off campus.

"(f) Any head coach, assistant coach or part-time assistant coach as specified in the paragraphs above may recruit off campus, but no other member of the institution's athletic department staff may recruit off campus unless he is counted against the limitations on number of coaches. A countable coach in the sport of football or basketball may recruit prospects in other sports, but a countable coach in any sport other than football or basketball may not recruit prospects in football or basketball.

"(g) An individual who engages in coaching under the terms of the above paragraphs and receives compensation or remuneration from the institution for any reason whatsoever shall be classified as a head coach or an assistant coach in accordance with the applicable paragraph above if that compensation or remuneration exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses as defined by Constitution 3-1-(f)-(1). Any individual who engages in coaching and receives compensation or remuneration not in excess of commonly accepted educational expenses at that institution shall be classified as a part-time assistant coach in accordance with applicable paragraph above, except for the volunteer coach permitted in paragraph (e). The part-time assistant coach may receive actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his coaching duties in addition to the compensation indicated.

"(h) The NCAA Council, by two-thirds vote of those present and voting, may waive limitations on number of coaches in circumstances where academic tenure, enforceable contracts or formal security of employment commitments make it impossible to comply with the limitations. Member institutions must apply for such waivers prior to August 1, 1976."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit the number of coaches in each division that may be employed by a member institution in all sports other than football and basketball; to specify the counting procedure for those coaching in more than one sport; to clarify which coaches may be permitted to recruit off campus, and in what sports; to define full-time and part-time coaches, and to establish a procedure for waiver of these limitations under prescribed conditions.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

[NOTE: The NCAA Meeting on Economy did not deal specifically with limitations on number of coaches in sports other than football and basketball. The Special Committee on Length of Season proposed the limitations and definitions in this amendment, which were modified slightly by the NCAA Council.]

Action: Motion to remove from table defeated.

NO. 10 COACHING STAFFS

Amend Proposal No. 9; Bylaw 12-1, as follows:

"(e) No individual other than those specified in the applicable paragraph above may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution during any game, practice or other organized activity in the sports listed, except that a member institution may permit an uncompensated volunteer to participate in such coaching provided no more than one such person is involved in a sport, he receives no compensation or remuneration of any sort, including expenses, from the institution's department of athletics and he is not permitted to recruit off campus; further, a member institution may permit undergraduate student-athletes who have completed their eligibility to participate in such coaching provided they are completing the requirements for their baccalaureate degree, they remain full-time students in the institution, they receive no compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution other than the financial aid they received as student-athletes and they are not permitted to recruit off campus.

"(f) An individual who coaches and receives compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution without such compensation or remuneration being designated for coaching shall be designated as a head coach, assistant coach, part-time coach or volunteer by certification of the institution.

[Reletter subsequent paragraphs.]

"(g) (h) An individual who engages in coaching under the terms of the above paragraphs and receives compensation or remuneration from the institution's department of athletics for any reason whatsoever shall be classified as a head coach or an assistant coach in accordance with the applicable paragraph above if that compensation or remuneration exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses as defined by Constitution 3-1-(f)-(1). Any individual who engages in coaching and receives from the department of athletics compensation or remuneration not in excess of commonly accepted educational expenses at that institution shall be classified as a part-time assistant coach in accordance with applicable paragraph above, except for the volunteer coach permitted in paragraph (e). The part-time assistant coach may receive actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his coaching duties in addition to the compensation indicated."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 10.

NO. 11 COACHING STAFFS

Amend Proposal No. 9; Bylaw 12-1, as follows:

"Section 1. Number of Coaches. A member institution shall not employ or otherwise utilize the services of coaches for varsity teams in excess of the following numbers:

[Subparagraphs (a) through (d) remain unchanged.]

"(e) No individual other than those specified in the applicable paragraph above may participate in any manner in the coaching of the varsity intercollegiate team of a member institution.

tution. . . . [Remainder of subparagraph (e) remains unchanged.]

"(f) Any varsity head coach, assistant varsity coach or part-time assistant varsity coach as specified in the paragraphs above may recruit off campus, [Remainder of subparagraph (f) remains unchanged.]

"(g) An individual who engages in coaching a varsity inter-collegiate team under the terms of the above paragraphs. . . ." [Remainder of subparagraph (g) remains unchanged.]

Source: U.S. Air Force Academy.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 10.

NO. 12 COACHING STAFFS

Amend Proposal No. 9; Bylaw 12-1, by adding new paragraph (e), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(e) If a member institution sponsors more than one inter-collegiate team in any of the sports listed in the subparagraphs above, that member institution may employ or otherwise utilize an additional part-time coach in such sports. Coaches employed or otherwise utilized for the purposes of this subparagraph are prohibited from off-campus recruiting. Additional teams for the purposes of this subparagraph must play four or more inter-collegiate contests during the appropriate sports season."

Source: Ivy Group.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 10.

NO. 13 COACHING STAFFS

Amend Proposal No. 9; Bylaw 12-1, as follows:

"(a) Baseball, Ice Hockey, Swimming/Water Polo, Cross Country/Track, Soccer, Lacrosse, Gymnastics, Wrestling. Two coaches in each sport or combination of sports, either full-time or part-time.

[Delete subparagraph (b) and reletter subsequent paragraphs.]

Source: Johns Hopkins University, Western Maryland College, Big Ten Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 10.

NO. 14 COACHING STAFFS

Amend Proposal No. 9; Bylaw 12-1, as follows:

"(b) Soccer, Lacrosse, Gymnastics, Wrestling, Fencing. Two coaches in each sport, of which no more than one may be a full-time coach.

"(c) Fencing, Golf, Skiing, Tennis, Volleyball. One coach in each sport, either full-time or part-time."

Source: Baruch College, New York University.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 10.

NO. 15 COACHING STAFFS

Amend Proposal No. 9; Bylaw 12-1, as follows:

"(e) In Divisions I and II, no individual other than those spe-

cified in the applicable paragraph above may participate. . . ." [Remainder of subparagraph (e) remains unchanged.]

Source: College of Wooster.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 10.

NO. 16 COACHING STAFFS

Amend Proposal No. 9; Bylaw 12-1, by eliminating the present language and substituting the following:

"(h) These limitations on the number of coaches do not apply in circumstances where academic tenure, enforceable contracts or formal security of employment commitments in effect on August 15, 1975, make it impossible to comply with the limitations. These exceptions are continued until normal attrition makes it possible to comply with these limitations."

Source: Big Ten Conference; University of California, Berkeley.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 10.

NO. 17 COACHING STAFFS

Amend Proposal No. 9; Bylaw 12-1, as follows:

"Effective Date: August 1, 1976 1977."

Source: Western Athletic Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 10.

NO. 18 COACHING STAFFS

Amend Proposal No. 9; Bylaw 12-1, as follows:

"Effective Date: August 1, 1976. By normal attrition with final adjustment achieved by August 1, 1979."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 10.

POSTPONED PROPOSALS

NO. 19 CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION PROGRAM

Bylaws: Amend Article 1 by adding a new Section 9, page 40, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"Section 9. Candidate's Declaration Program. The issuance of a candidate's declaration form by a member institution, and the acceptance thereof by a prospective student-athlete, shall be governed by the following procedures:

"(a) A member institution shall not be required to utilize the candidate's declaration procedures, except that all member institutions shall respect a prospective member institution pursuant to the procedures established by this Section, and all members shall observe the quiet periods, the athletic recruiting prohibitions and the enforcement measures established by this Section.

"(b) A member institution or allied conference shall not utilize any other letter-of-intent, candidate's acceptance or comparable procedure in obtaining the commitment of a prospective student-athlete to attend the institution except for an institution's normal application for admissions procedures which apply to all student applicants.

"(c) A prospective student-athlete may sign only one candidate's declaration form. The subsequent signing of a second form by a prospective student-athlete to attend another member institution shall not be permitted and any such declaration shall be invalid.

"(d) In the event a prospective student-athlete submits his declaration to a member institution, no member of any other institution's athletic staff or other representative of its athletic interests shall, after such declaration by the prospective student-athlete, solicit his enrollment or offer financial aid or other inducements to enroll.

"(e) A member institution shall not violate the quiet periods established by these procedures.

"(f) The candidate's declaration form shall be used only for those prospective student-athletes who initially enroll as a regular student in a member institution for the fall term of each academic year.

"(g) A member institution implementing the candidate's declaration program shall follow the procedures established in this Section as to the offering of a candidate's declaration form to a prospective student-athlete to participate in its program, and as to acceptance thereof by the prospective student-athlete, as follows:

"(1) A declaration form approved by the Council shall not be mailed to a prospective student-athlete in the sport of football earlier than the Sunday following the first Saturday in February. The prospective student-athlete may not sign the declaration form earlier than 8:00 a.m. of the Friday following the Sunday mailing date.

"(2) The institution shall be committed to accept a prospective student-athlete as a participant in its intercollegiate football program during the first academic year of residence who returns the declaration form, properly executed, not later than the third Saturday in February. If the declaration form is received by the member institution after the third Saturday in February, the institution shall promptly determine whether to reaffirm its invitation and shall notify the prospective student-athlete within ten days after receipt of his acceptance of its original invitation.

"(3) The same provisions under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply for basketball except that the mailing to the prospective student-athlete shall not be earlier than the Sunday following the second Saturday in April, the prospective student-athlete may not sign the declaration form earlier than 8:00 a.m. of the Friday following the Sunday mailing date, and the signed forms must be received by the institution not later than the fourth Saturday in April.

"(4) The same provisions under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply for all other sports except that the mailing to the prospective student-athlete shall not be earlier than the Sunday following the second Saturday in May, the prospective student-athlete may not sign the declaration form earlier than 8:00 a.m. of the Friday following the Sunday mailing date, and the forms must be received by the institution not later than the fourth Saturday in May.

"(5) A member of an institution's athletic staff or other representative of its athletic interests shall not contact the prospective student-athlete during a quiet period beginning on the permissible mailing date for the sport and ending at midnight of the second Saturday following the mailing date.

"(6) A member institution shall submit a list of those prospective student-athletes (and their addresses) issued a candidate's declaration form, as well as those prospects signing its declaration forms, to the NCAA national office not later than the third Saturday following the applicable initial mailing date.

"(7) If, after the initial mailing of declaration forms, a member institution desires to obtain commitments from additional prospective student-athletes not yet committed through these procedures, the institution may mail additional declaration forms after the quiet period until June 1. The institution shall be committed to accept a prospective student-athlete as a participant in its intercollegiate program during the first academic year in residence who returns the form, properly executed, not later than two weeks from the date it was mailed. The procedures in the event of a later return shall be the same as provided in paragraph (2) with respect to an initial mailing. There shall be no quiet period with respect to declaration forms mailed after the initial quiet period of paragraph (5). A member institution shall submit to the NCAA national office the names and addresses of the prospective student-athletes issued a candidate's declaration form, as well as those prospects signing its declaration forms, not later than one week after the date of the signing.

"(8) The candidate's declaration procedure shall not be used between June 15 and the initial mailing date set forth in paragraphs (1), (3) and (4); therefore, only properly executed declaration forms on file with the institution by June 15 shall be valid. Further, athletically related financial aid shall not be awarded by an institution to any student-athlete during his first full academic year in residence as a regular student who has not by June 15 signed a declaration form forwarded by the institution in accordance with these procedures.

"(9) A student-athlete who submits declaration forms to two or more member institutions shall be ineligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) during the first full academic year in residence as a regular student and shall be eligible for only two seasons of intercollegiate competition in any sport at all member institutions except the one to which he first submitted a declaration form.

"(10) A student-athlete who submits a declaration form to one member institution but attends another member institution shall be ineligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at the second institution until he has completed one full academic year in residence as a regular student, and thereafter he shall be eligible for only two seasons of intercollegiate competition in each sport in which he competes.

"(11) A student-athlete who attends the institution to which he submitted his original declaration form, but during the course of his first academic year transfers to a second member institution, shall be ineligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at the second institution until he has completed one full academic year in residence as a regular student, and thereafter he shall be eligible for only two seasons of intercollegiate competition in each sport in which he competes. (The declaration form and its implementing provisions have no further applicability to a student-athlete following his completion of a full academic year at the institution to which he submitted his original acceptance.)

"(12) A prospective student-athlete who submits a declaration form but does not attend any collegiate institution for at least two full academic years shall be fully released from that acceptance.

"(13) The following rules shall govern the applicability of the candidate's declaration form to prospective student-athletes who attend junior colleges:

"(a) A student-athlete who submits a declaration form to a member institution, but instead attends a junior college for less than two full academic years and does not graduate, shall upon transfer to an NCAA member:

"(i) Be obligated to attend the member institution to which he originally submitted a declaration form if that institution reaffirms its original invitation; or,

"(ii) If the first institution does not reaffirm its original invitation, the student-athlete shall be fully released from that declaration; or,

"(iii) If the first institution reaffirms its original invitation and the student-athlete attends another member institution, he shall be ineligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at the second institution until he has completed one full academic year, and thereafter he shall be eligible for only two varsity years in each sport in which he competes.

"(b) A student-athlete who submits a declaration form to a member institution but instead attends a junior college shall be fully released from that declaration if he graduates from a junior college or attends a junior college for two full academic years.

"(14) A prospective student-athlete who is denied admission or is not awarded financial aid during his first academic year in residence by the institution with which he initially signed a

declaration form, shall be fully released from that declaration and the institution shall be fully released from its invitation.

"(15) If a prospective student-athlete's parent or legal guardian fails to sign the declaration form, it shall be null and void.

"(16) The Council is authorized to act on questions of restoration of eligibility under this Section, to adopt forms for use by member institutions and specify details to be followed in the use of such forms, and to establish such additional procedures as it deems necessary.

"(17) Upon petition by a student's institution, the NCAA Council may restore eligibility in whole or in part if it is determined by a favorable vote of two-thirds of its members present and voting that unforeseen and unusual circumstances of major consequence unrelated to the athletic interests of the institution or the student warrant such a decision.

"(18) The Council shall publish and distribute to the members the procedures and implementing rules.

"(19) The procedures established by the Council may be reviewed by the annual Convention in the manner provided for review of interpretations in Constitution 6-2."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish procedures for issuance and return of declaration forms by prospective student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately; applicable to all student-athletes first entering a member institution during the fall term, 1976-77 academic year, or thereafter.

[NOTE: Division I delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy in Intercollegiate Athletics recommended an NCAA candidate's commitment program to include the elimination of other institutional, conference and national letter-of-intent programs, a common signing date for all institutions, a quiet period during which the prospective student-athlete may not be contacted and the establishment of procedures for the program which would be compatible with other proposed recruiting amendments designed to limit the recruiting period, thereby reducing recruiting costs. Division II delegates recommended the adoption of a similar program. Division III delegates were not in favor of a candidate's declaration program for Division III.]

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 20 CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION PROGRAM

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 19; Bylaw 1-9-(g)-(1), (2), (3) and (4), as follows:

(1) A declaration form for football fall sports approved by the Council shall not be mailed to a prospective student-athlete earlier than the Sunday following the first Saturday in February. The prospective student-athlete may not sign the declaration form earlier than 8:00 a.m. of the Friday following the Sunday mailing date.

"(2) The institution shall be committed to accept a prospective student-athlete as a participant in its intercollegiate foot-

ball fall sports program during the first academic year of residence who returns the declaration form, properly executed, not later than the third Saturday in February. If the declaration form is received by the member institution after the third Saturday in February, the institution shall promptly determine whether to reaffirm its invitation and shall notify the prospective student-athlete within ten days after receipt of his acceptance of its original invitation.

"(3) The same provisions under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply for basketball winter sports except that the mailing to the prospective student-athlete shall not be earlier than the Sunday following the second Saturday in April, the prospective student-athlete may not sign the declaration form earlier than 8:00 a.m. of the Friday following the Sunday mailing date, and the signed forms must be received by the institution not later than the fourth Saturday in April.

"(4) The same provisions under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply for all other spring sports except that the mailing to the prospective student-athlete shall not be earlier than the Sunday following the second Saturday in May, the prospective student-athlete may not sign the declaration form earlier than 8:00 a.m. of the Friday following the Sunday mailing date, and the forms must be received by the institution not later than the fourth Saturday in May."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify that procedures for issuance and return of declaration forms by prospective student-athletes shall be common for all sports within each sports season.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 19.

NO. 21 CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION PROGRAM

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 19; Bylaw 1-9-(g), by adding new paragraph (5), as follows:

"(5) For prospective student-athletes enrolled in junior colleges, the signing dates shall be as follows: Fall Sports—December 20; Winter Sports—May 15; Spring Sports—June 1. All other provisions of the candidate's declaration procedures shall apply."

Source: University of Arkansas, Southern Methodist University, University of Texas.

Intent: To include specific signing dates for prospective student-athletes enrolled in junior colleges to reduce expenses of recruiting such prospects during holiday periods.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 19.

NO. 22 CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION PROGRAM

Amend Proposal No. 19; Bylaw 1-9, as follows:

"Section 9. Candidate's Declaration Program. The issuance of

a candidate's declaration form by a member institution, and the acceptance thereof by a prospective student-athlete, shall be governed by the following procedures:

"(a) A member institution shall not be required to utilize the candidate's declaration procedures, except that all member institutions shall respect a prospective student-athlete's declaration established by this Section, and all members shall observe the quiet periods, the athletic recruiting prohibitions and the enforcement measures established by this Section. the Collegiate Commissioners Association.

[Paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) remain unchanged.]

"(e) A member institution shall not violate the quiet periods established by these procedures.

"(f) (e) The candidate's declaration form shall be used only for those prospective student-athletes who initially enroll as a regular student in a member institution for the fall term of each academic year.

"(g) A member institution implementing the candidate's declaration program shall follow the procedures established in this Section as to the offering of a candidate's declaration form to a prospective student-athlete to participate in its program, and as to acceptance thereof by the prospective student-athlete, as follows:

"(f) All restrictions and penalties prescribed by the Inter-conference Letter-of-Intent (as administered by the Collegiate Commissioners Association in the 1974-75 academic year) will apply unless changed by the Association in duly authorized Convention procedures."

[All subsequent paragraphs to be deleted.]

Source: Virginia Military Institute.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 19.

NO. 23 CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION PROGRAM

Amend Proposal No. 22; Bylaw 1-9, as follows:

"Section 9. Candidate's Declaration Program. The issuance of a candidate's declaration form by a member institution, and the acceptance thereof by a prospective student-athlete, shall be governed by the following procedures:

"(a) A member institution shall not be required to utilize the candidate's declaration procedures, except that all member institutions shall respect a prospective student-athlete's declaration to attend a selected member institution pursuant to the procedures established by the Collegiate Commissioners Association this Section.

[Paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) remain unchanged.]

"(f) The procedure for administering the candidate's declaration program will be established by the NCAA Council in line with the procedures having been utilized in the Collegiate Commissioners Association Inter-Conference Letter of Intent, and administration of the program will remain in the hands of the Collegiate Commissioners Association."

[All subsequent paragraphs to be deleted.]

Source: Virginia Military Institute.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 19.

NO. 24 CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION PROGRAM

Amend Proposal No. 19; Bylaw 1-9, as follows:

"(d) In the event a prospective student-athlete submits his declaration to a member institution, no member of any other institution's athletic staff or other representative of its athletic interests shall, after such declaration by the prospective student-athlete, solicit his enrollment or offer financial aid or other inducements to enroll.

[Reletter subsequent paragraphs.]

"(1) A declaration form approved by the Council shall not be mailed to a prospective student-athlete in the sport of football earlier than the Sunday following the first third Saturday in February. The prospective student-athlete may not sign the declaration form earlier than 8:00 a.m. of the Friday following the Sunday mailing date.

"(2) The institution shall be committed to accept a prospective student-athlete as a participant in its intercollegiate football program during the first academic year of residence who returns the declaration form, properly executed, not later than the third Saturday in February second Saturday after mailing. If the declaration form is received by the member institution after the third Saturday in February second Saturday after mailing, the institution shall promptly determine whether to reaffirm its invitation and shall notify the prospective student-athlete within ten days after receipt of his acceptance of its original invitation.

"(3) The same provisions under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply for basketball except that the mailing to the prospective student-athlete shall not be earlier than the Sunday following the second Saturday in April, the prospective student-athlete may not sign the declaration form earlier than 8:00 a.m. of the Friday following the Sunday mailing date, and the signed forms must be received by the institution not later than the fourth Saturday in April second Saturday after mailing.

"(4) The same provisions under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply for all other sports except that the mailing to the prospective student-athlete shall not be earlier than the Sunday following the second Saturday in May, the prospective student-athlete may not sign the declaration form earlier than 8:00 a.m. of the Friday following the Sunday mailing date, and the forms must be received by the institution not later than the fourth Saturday in May second Saturday after mailing.

"(6) A member institution shall submit a list of those prospective student-athletes (and their addresses) issued a candidate's declaration form, as well as those prospects signing its declaration forms, to the NCAA national office not later than the third fifth Saturday following the applicable initial mailing date.

"(8) The candidate's declaration procedure shall not be used between June 15 August 1 and the initial mailing date set forth in paragraphs (1), (3) and (4); therefore, only properly executed declaration forms on file with the institution by June 15 August 1 shall be valid. Further, athletically related financial aid shall not be awarded by an institution to any student-athlete during his first full academic year in residence as a regular student who has not by June 15 signed a declaration form forwarded by the institution in accordance with these procedures."

[All other paragraphs remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 19.

UNCONSIDERED PROPOSALS

NO. 25 LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING

Bylaws: Add a new Bylaw 12, Personnel and Squad Limitations, following page 92; Section 3 to read as follows:

Section 3. Limitations on Scouting. A member institution shall not pay or permit the payment of expenses incurred by its athletic department staff members or representatives, including professional scouting services, to scout its opponents or individuals who represent its opponents in any sport except basketball where it shall be permissible for the institution to pay expenses to scout each opponent on one occasion. It shall be permissible to pay the costs of exchanging films for scouting purposes in any sport."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit the payment of expenses for in-person scouting of an institution's opponents, except for the sport of basketball, and to permit the exchange of films for scouting purposes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Division I and Division II delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy endorsed the concept of prohibiting scouting in football, utilizing a film exchange program instead. Basketball exemption is based on the infrequent availability of film in that sport. Division III delegates to that meeting believed scouting should be a matter of institutional or conference policy.]

Action: Approved by Division I, 109-103 (121-105 on recount); defeated by Division II, 47-64, and by Division III.

NO. 26 LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING

Amend Proposal No. 25; Bylaw 12-3, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Scouting. A member institution shall not pay or permit the payment of expenses incurred by its athletic department staff members or representatives, including professional scouting services, to scout its each opponents or individuals who represent its each opponents in any sport except basketball where it shall be permissible for the

institution to pay expenses to scout each opponent on more than one occasion. It shall be permissible to pay the costs of exchanging films for scouting purposes in any sport."

Source: University of Pennsylvania.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 27 LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING

Amend Proposal No. 25; Bylaw 12-3, by adding a new subparagraph (a), as follows:

"(a) The limitations provided for in this Section shall not apply to intra-conference games or contests."

Source: University of Oklahoma.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 28 LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING

Amend Proposal No. 25; Bylaw 12-3, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Scouting. A member institution shall not pay or permit the payment of expenses incurred by its athletic department staff members or representatives, including professional scouting services, to scout its opponents or individuals who represent its opponents in any sport except basketball where it shall be permissible for the institution to pay expenses to scout each opponent on one occasion, and football where it shall be permissible for the institution to pay expenses for one individual to scout one game played by each of its opponents. It shall be permissible to pay the costs of exchanging films for scouting purposes in any sport."

Source: Southeastern Conference.

Action: Defeated by Division I football, 56-76, and by Division II and Division III football.

NO. 29 PRESEASON PRACTICE

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, pages 46-47, as follows:

"Section 1. Limitations on Preseason Practice. (a) A member institution shall not commence preseason practice in any sport prior to the following dates:

Baseball—February 1

Basketball—October 15 November 1

Cross Country—Fifteen calendar days prior to first scheduled intercollegiate meet

Fencing—November 1

Football—Nineteen calendar days prior to first scheduled intercollegiate game, or twenty-second day before next-to-last Saturday in September, or that date which will permit a maximum of twenty-nine 'practice opportunities' prior to first scheduled intercollegiate game

Golf—February 1

Gymnastics—October 15

Ice Hockey—October 15

Lacrosse—Thirty calendar days prior to first scheduled intercollegiate game

Skiing—November 1

Soccer—Fifteen calendar days prior to first scheduled intercollegiate game

Swimming—November 1

Tennis—February 1

Indoor Track—November 1

Outdoor Track—March 1; or February 1 for member institutions which do not conduct an indoor track program and compete in no indoor track meets

Volleyball—January 10

Water Polo—Fifteen calendar days prior to first scheduled intercollegiate competition

Wrestling—October 15

"(b) In determining the number of 'practice opportunities' in the sport of football, Sundays will be excluded from the counting, but otherwise there shall be counted one for each day beginning with the opening of classes, one for each day classes are not in session in the week of the first scheduled intercollegiate game and two for each other day in the pre-season practice period.

"(b) (c) In the sport of football, physical activity during the first three days of the preseason practice period shall be limited to non-contact conditioning drills. No football gear or protective equipment other than headgear, shoes and porous light-weight jerseys and pants shall be worn by players during practice sessions in this three-day period.

[O.I. 300 remains unchanged.]

"(f) (d) On the day before the opening of permissible practice, as specified in Bylaw 3-1-(a) and Bylaw 3-1-(d), it shall be permissible to issue equipment, have medical examinations and take squad pictures and, in the event this day falls on Sunday, it shall be permissible to utilize the day preceding that Sunday for this purpose. As an exception in basketball only, it shall be permissible to designate a single date for the taking of squad pictures following the beginning of classes in the fall term and prior to the opening of permissible practice as specified in Bylaw 3-1-(d) (a).

[NOTE: The provisions of O.I. 303, O.I. 304, O.I. 305, O.I. 308, O.I. 309 and O.I. 310 shall be applicable in defining the foregoing limitations on pre-season practice.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit pre-season practice in all sports and to modify existing legislation regarding pre-season practice in football and basketball accordingly.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Time did not permit Division I delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy to discuss limitations on length of season; Division II delegates favored establishment of limitations in accordance with recommendations of the Special Committee on Length of Season; Division III delegates did not take specific action in this regard but urged examination of the possibility

of eliminating any overlapping of sports seasons. The Special Committee on Length of Season recommended the limitations prescribed in this amendment. Slight modifications have been made by the NCAA Council.]

Action: Tabled by all three divisions along with amendments to No. 29 (Nos. 31-35).

NO. 30 PRESEASON PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 29; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 1. Limitations on Preseason Practice. (a) A member institution shall not commence preseason practice in any sport prior to the following date:

"Baseball—February 1

"Swimming—November 1"

Source: Purdue University.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 31 PRESEASON PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 29; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 1. Limitations on Preseason Practice. (a) A member institution shall not commence preseason practice in any sport prior to the following dates:

"Cross Country—Fifteen calendar days prior to first scheduled intercollegiate meet, or the beginning day of the academic year, whichever is earliest."

"Fencing—November 1

"Golf—February 1

"Gymnastics—October 15

"Lacrosse—Thirty calendar days prior to first scheduled intercollegiate game

"Soccer—Fifteen calendar days prior to first scheduled intercollegiate game

"Tennis—February 1

"Indoor Track—November 1

"Outdoor Track—March 1; or February 1 for member institutions which do not conduct an indoor track program and compete in no indoor meets."

Source: Adelphi University. Purdue University joins in sponsoring the amendment regarding golf, tennis and indoor track. University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, and Southern Connecticut State College join in sponsoring the amendment regarding gymnastics.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II; defeated by Division III (see No. 29).

NO. 32 PRESEASON PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 29; Bylaw 3-1 as follows:

"Section 1. Limitations on Preseason Practice. (a) A member institution shall not commence preseason practice in any sport prior to the following dates:

"Fencing—November 1 October 1"

Source: Baruch College, New York University.

Action: See No. 29.

NO. 33 PRESEASON PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 29; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 1. Limitations on Preseason Practice. (a) A member institution shall not commence preseason practice in any sport prior to the following dates:

"Ice Hockey—October 15 October 1"

Source: Michigan State University.

Action: See No. 29.

NO. 34 PRESEASON PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 29; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 1. Limitations on Preseason Practice. (a) A member institution shall not commence preseason practice in any sport prior to the following dates:

"Lacrosse—Thirty calendar days prior to first scheduled intercollegiate game First week in January"

Source: Hobart College.

Action: See No. 29.

NO. 35 PRESEASON PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 29; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 1. Limitations on Preseason Practice. (a) A member institution shall not commence preseason practice in any sport prior to the following dates:

"Outdoor Track—March 1; or February 1 for member institutions which do not conduct an indoor track program and compete in no indoor track meets"

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Action: See No. 29.

NO. 36 PRESEASON PRACTICE

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, pages 46-47, renumbering subsequent Sections, as follows:

"Section 1 2. Limitations on Playing Seasons. (a) A member institution shall limit its contests (games, scrimmages, meets or other competition) with outside competition in any sport to the periods of time specified in this Section.

"(b) The first contest (game, scrimmage, meet or other competition) with outside competition shall not be played prior to the following dates:

Baseball—February 10, except for any contests conducted during the permissible out-of-season period specified in Bylaw 3-2- (b)

Basketball—Last Friday in November

Cross Country—Second Saturday in September

Fencing—Last Friday in November

Football—The traditional fall season, exclusive of one scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided that the game be with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students, or both, and exclusive of (i) one postseason game approved by the Association's Extra Events Committee or (ii) those games played in the National Collegiate Division II and Division III Football Championships

Golf—February 10, except for any contests conducted during the permissible out-of-season period specified in Bylaw 3-2-(b)

Gymnastics—Last Friday in November

Ice Hockey—November 15

Lacrosse—March 15

Skiing—December 15

Soccer—Second Saturday in September

Swimming—Last Friday in November

Tennis—February 10, except for any contests conducted during the permissible out-of-season period specified in Bylaw 3-2-(b)

Indoor Track—Last Friday in November

Outdoor Track—March 1; or February 10 for member institutions which do not conduct an indoor track program and compete in no indoor track meets

Volleyball—February 1

Water Polo—Second Saturday in September

Wrestling—November 15

"(c) The last contest (game, scrimmage, meet or other competition) with outside competition in each sport shall not be played after the National Collegiate Championship in that sport.

"O.I. 301. The 'traditional fall season' in the sport of football is the period from September 1 through the second Saturday in December.

"O.I. 302. 'Outside competition' includes contests with alumni teams of the institution.

"(d) Informal practice scrimmages with outside competition may be permitted prior to the *last Friday in November* permissible first competition date provided they are conducted in private without publicity or official scoring and provided further that such scrimmages shall be counted against the permissible number of contests.

"(g) (e) One basketball game may be played against a 'club' member of the Amateur Basketball Association of the United States of America, or against a foreign team in the United States, either of which may be played after November 1."

"(h) (f) Member institutions located in Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico shall not be required to observe the starting dates for the football and basketball practice and playing seasons set forth in Bylaws 3-1-(a), (c), (d) and (e) and Bylaw 3-2 provided, however, that the amount of practice and number of contests engaged in by such institutions in each sport shall not

exceed the amount of practice, length of season and number of contests in each sport permitted other members of the Association."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit the length of season in each sport by specifying the permissible date of first contest and end of playing season in each.

Effective Date: Immediately, except for enforceable contract obligations; all sports must be in conformity by August 1, 1976.

[NOTE: See note following Proposal No. 29 for reaction of NCAA Meeting on Economy. The Special Committee on Length of Season recommended the limitations contained herein (which were modified slightly by the NCAA Council) not only because of the economic implications but also in the interest of reducing the amount of time student-athletes must devote to their sports at the possible expense of their academic and social involvement.]

Action: Tabled by all three divisions along with amendments to No. 36 (Nos. 37-42).

NO. 37 PLAYING SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 36; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"(b) The first contest (game, scrimmage, meet or other competition) with outside competition shall not be played prior to the following dates:

"Ice Hockey—November 15 Second Friday in November"

Source: Saint Louis University.

Action: See No. 36.

NO. 38 PLAYING SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 36; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"(b) The first contest (game, scrimmage, meet or other competition) with outside competition shall not be played prior to the following dates:

"Ice Hockey—November 15 November 1"

Source: Michigan State University

Action: See No. 36.

NO. 39 PLAYING SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 36; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"(b) The first contest (game, scrimmage, meet or other competition) with outside competition shall not be played prior to the following dates:

"Ice Hockey—November 15 Last Friday in October"

Source: University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

Action: See No. 36.

NO. 40 PLAYING SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 36; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"(b) The first contest (game, scrimmage, meet or other competition) with outside competition shall not be played prior to the following dates:

"Soccer—Second Saturday in September First Saturday in September"

Source: Saint Louis University.

Action: See No. 36.

NO. 41 PLAYING SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 36; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"(b) The first contest (game, scrimmage, meet or other competition) with outside competition shall not be played prior to the following dates:

"Outdoor Track—March 1, or February 10 for member institutions which do not conduct an indoor track program and compete in no indoor track meets."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Action: See No. 36.

NO. 42 PLAYING SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 36; Bylaw 3-1, by deleting subparagraph (c) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(c) The last contest (game, scrimmage, meet or other competition) with outside competition in each sport shall not be played after the National Collegiate Championship in that sport."

Source: University of Wisconsin, Green Bay.

Action: See No. 36.

NO. 43 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, pages 46-47, renumbering subsequent Sections, as follows:

"Section 1 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

Baseball—Thirty-six, including any dates utilized for competition during the permissible out-of-season period specified in Bylaw 3-2-(b)

Basketball—Twenty-seven

Cross Country—Ten

Fencing—Twelve

Football—Eleven

Golf—Twelve, including any dates utilized for competition during the permissible out-of-season period specified in Bylaw 3-2-(b)

Gymnastics—Twelve

Ice Hockey—Thirty

Lacrosse—Thirteen

Skiing—Twelve

Soccer—Thirteen

Swimming—Fourteen

Tennis—Eighteen, including any dates utilized for competition during the permissible out-of-season period specified in Bylaw 3-2-(b)

Indoor Track—Nine

Outdoor Track—Twelve

Volleyball—Sixteen

Water Polo—Ten

Wrestling—Sixteen

"(b) The maximum number of playing dates in football shall exclude the spring scrimmage and postseason games permitted in Bylaw 3-1-(a).

"(c) The maximum number of playing dates in basketball shall exclude contests in one postseason tournament in accordance with O.I. 307. No postseason tournament contest shall be played after the final game of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship. In addition, two teams may participate in an experimental basketball game sponsored by the Association, with experimental factors under control of the Basketball Rules Committee, to be held at the site of the finals of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship.

"(d) In the sports of football, basketball and ice hockey, no intercollegiate team shall play more than one contest on a playing date.

"(e) In the team sports of baseball, lacrosse, soccer, volleyball and water polo, multi-contest scheduling (e.g., double-headers, triple-headers) held on a single day at a single site shall be counted as one playing date. Multi-day tournaments, however, shall count as one playing date for each day the team competes.

"(f) In the individual sports of cross country, fencing, golf, gymnastics, skiing, swimming, tennis, indoor track, outdoor track and wrestling, multi-contest competition (e.g., double-duals, triple-duals) held on a single day at a single site shall be counted as one playing date; further, a multi-day tournament held at the same site on consecutive days shall also be counted as one playing date.

"(g) One basketball game played against a 'club' member of the Amateur Basketball Association of the United States of America, or against a foreign team in the United States (either of which may be played after November 1), or any game or basketball games or contests in other sports played in Hawaii, either against or under the sponsorship of the University of Hawaii, or in Alaska, either against or under the sponsorship of the University of Alaska, shall not be considered a 'contest' or 'contests' in computing the maximum playing schedule under Bylaw 3-1-(c) or Bylaw 3-1-(e) as specified in this Section."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit the number of playing dates in all sports; to establish counting procedures for purposes of this legislation, and to extend the Alaska-Hawaii exception to all sports.

Effective Date: Immediately, except for enforceable contract obligations; all sports must be in conformity by August 1, 1976.

[NOTE: The NCAA Meeting on Economy did not take a position on this proposal, with the sense of that meeting being to await later recommendations by the Special Committee on Length of Season. That Committee met following the economy meeting and submitted the recommended limitations contained herein, which were modified slightly by the NCAA Council. The Committee's recommendations were based on economic considerations, reduction of the time a student-athlete must devote to his sport at the expense of his academic and social involvement, and the opinion expressed by some member institutions that all sports should be limited in the same manner as football and basketball.]

Action: Tabled by Divisions I, 125-99, and by Division III; defeated by Division II, 55-70 (also see Nos. 44-56).

NO. 44 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Baseball—*Thirty-six Forty-eight*, including any dates utilized for competition during the permissible out-of-season period specified in Bylaw 3-2-(b)."

Source: Western Athletic Conference.

Action: Motion to adopt failed to receive a second in Division II.

NO. 45 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Ice Hockey—*Thirty Thirty-six*"

Source: Michigan State University.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 46 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Ice Hockey—*Thirty Thirty-six*, exclusive of conference playoff games"

Source: University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

Action: Not introduced.

NO. 47 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Soccer—*Thirteen Fourteen*"

Source: Ivy Group.

Action: Motion to adopt failed to receive a second.

NO. 48 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Soccer—*Thirteen Fifteen*"

Source: University of Bridgeport, University of New Haven.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 49 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Soccer—*Thirteen Eighteen*"

Source: Saint Louis University.

Action: Defeated by Division II, 29-73.

NO. 50 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Indoor Track—*Nine Eleven*"

Source: Ivy Group.

Action: Not introduced.

NO. 51 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Indoor Track/**Outdoor Track—Nine Twenty-one**
"Outdoor Track—*Twelve*"

Source: University of Washington.

Action: Motion to adopt failed to receive a second.

NO. 52 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Water Polo—*Ten Sixteen*"

Source: California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 53 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Water Polo—*Ten Twenty*"

Source: Stanford University.

Action: Not introduced.

NO. 54 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"Section 3. Limitations on Number of Playing Dates. (a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule for any intercollegiate team in any one year to the number of playing dates specified in this Section, exclusive of competition in the applicable NCAA championship.

"Baseball—*Thirty-six Forty*

"Cross Country—*Ten Twelve*

"Fencing—*Twelve Fifteen*

"Golf—*Twelve Sixteen*

"Lacrosse—*Thirteen Fifteen*

"Soccer—*Thirteen Fifteen*"

Source: New Jersey State College Athletic Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 43 by Division III.

NO. 55 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"(c) The maximum number of playing dates in basketball and baseball shall exclude contests in one postseason tournament in accordance with O.I. 307. No postseason tournament contest shall be played after the final game of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship or the National Collegiate Baseball Championship. In addition, two teams may participate in an experimental basketball game sponsored by the Association, with experimental factors under control of the Basketball Rules Committee, to be held at the site of the finals of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Action: Not introduced.

NO. 56 NUMBER OF PLAYING DATES

Amend Proposal No. 43; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"(e) In the team sports of baseball, lacrosse, soccer, volleyball and water polo, multi-contest scheduling (e.g., double-headers, triple-headers, tournaments) held on a single day at a single site shall be counted as one playing date. Multi-day tournaments, however, shall count as one playing date for each day the team competes."

Source: University of Wisconsin, Green Bay.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 57 OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2, pages 47-49, as follows:

"Section 2. Limitations on Out-of-Season Practice. (a) Postseason practice in football shall be limited to twenty sessions in a period of thirty-six calendar days (vacation and examination days excluded).

"(b) Postseason practice in baseball, golf and tennis shall be limited to twenty sessions or playing dates in a period of thirty-six calendar days (vacation and examination days excluded) in accordance with Bylaw 3-1-(a).

"(b) (c) Postseason practice in basketball, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, volleyball and water polo shall be prohibited; however, it shall be permissible in each sport to assemble the basketball squad for one day for purposes of taking squad pictures.

[O.I. 303 and O.I. 304 remain unchanged.]

"O.I. 305. Engaging in any or all of the following activities on any day constitutes 'practice': (a) Field or floor practice; (b) Chalk talk; (c) Lecture, or the discussion or showing of motion pictures.

"The duration and distribution of these activities on any day are to be determined by the institution itself, subject to con-

trolling legislation by the conference or similar organization of which the institution is a member; provided, however, that spring football or fall baseball practice sessions conducted during vacation periods may not be of longer duration than those normally held during days when academic classes are in session.

"O.I. 306. 'Postseason' practice is any practice or instruction in a sport held after the last game of any institution's playing season, and before the first day of the practice season for the next ensuing year. Postseason practice does not include practice for any established event, participation in which is not prohibited by the NCAA, provided such practice is limited to students eligible for that event; nor does it include a single game or contest played before the end of the NCAA championship in that sport between undergraduate student-athletes who are or were members of the institution's basketball squad and for which game or contest there is no organized practice (e.g., seniors vs. next year's squad).

"O.I. 307. A 'postseason tournament' contest in basketball is one between teams that are not identified until the close of the preceding regular season, the term 'postseason' necessarily implying that the time of the event shall be after a regular season. If a conference conducts a regularly scheduled, season-end, single-elimination tournament among some or all of its members then the game or games played by each team shall count as one of the permissible *twenty-six* regular season contests or playing dates and the tournament shall not be considered postseason. Institutions which tie for a conference championship may participate in a single-elimination playoff to determine the conference's automatic entry in an NCAA tournament without the game or games being counted as a regular-season contest or postseason tournament.

"O.I. 308. 'Calendar days,' insofar as the term applies to the period within which postseason practice in football, baseball, golf and tennis must fall, are consecutive days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar.

"O.I. 309. Regular physical education classes, with or without credit, which are listed in the institution's catalog and open to all students, shall not be construed to be practice activity under this rule.

"(a) Practice activity conducted under the guise of physical education class work, however, must be counted as practice sessions. For example, any class composed of, or including, the varsity football or basketball squad in any sport, either on a required attendance basis or where the class utilizes equipment for the sport, is prima facie evidence of practice activity.

"(b) It is permissible for a member of the athletic staff (including a football coach in any sport) to conduct a physical fitness class for male students of the institution provided:

"(1) Attendance of any varsity football players shall be on a voluntary basis;

"(2) The classes are open to any student of the institution;

"(3) The class hours and programs have been publicized in appropriate publications and/or on the proper bulletin boards of the institution.

"The class must be for physical fitness purposes only, therefore:

"(4) No football equipment of the particular sport may be used, including, in the sport of football, blocking dummies, machines, sleds, football shoes and like equipment;

"(5) Teaching of football fundamentals or techniques in the sport shall be prohibited;

"(6) No instruction in football the sport shall be permitted (this prohibition includes walking through offensive or defensive plays or similar instructional approaches);

"(7) Showing of football movies for instruction in the sport shall be prohibited.

"(8) Blocking dummies, machines, sleds and like equipment shall not be used;

"Subject to the foregoing conditions, participation by freshman or varsity football candidates student-athletes shall not be considered to be 'practice.'

"O.I. 310. The assembling of one or more members (who have eligibility remaining) of an institution's football or basketball squad in the sport for demonstration purposes in connection with a clinic or the production of a film is not permissible if it occurs outside the allowable playing and practice seasons; except that (a) if the television network which has the rights to the NCAA football television program requests an opportunity to film the football squad of a college which is to participate in the television series, said college may cooperate without such activity counting as a practice session; and (b) an institution which is conducting a project of the National Summer Youth Sports Program may employ football and basketball squad members in any sport in a supervisory and instructional capacity provided such employees do not engage in the practice of their respective sports."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit out-of-season practice in the sports of ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, volleyball and water polo and limit out-of-season practice in baseball, golf and tennis, as well as to continue the present prohibition of such practice in basketball and the present limitations of such practice in football; to revise O.I.'s 305 through 310 to apply the definitions and conditions of "practice" as defined therein to all sports.

Effective Date: September 1, 1975, except for enforceable contract obligations in baseball, golf and tennis; all must be in conformity by August 1, 1976.

[NOTE: The Special Committee on Length of Season submitted this proposal to limit or prohibit out-of-season practice in all team sports, rather than in football and basketball only; to make the season length limitations in Proposal No. 35 meaningful, and to reduce the amount of time a student-athlete may be required to devote to these sports at the expense of his academic and social

involvements. The limitations in baseball, golf and tennis recognize the climatic factors affecting those sports in certain geographic regions.]

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 36 along with amendments to No. 57 (Nos. 58-60).

NO. 58 OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 57; Bylaw 3-2, as follows:

"(b) Postseason practice in baseball, golf and tennis shall be limited to *twenty sessions or playing dates* in a period of *thirty-six forty-five* calendar days (vacation and examination days excluded) in accordance with Bylaw 3-1-(a)."

Source: American University, George Washington University, Georgetown University.

Action: See No. 57.

NO. 59 OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 57; Bylaw 3-2, as follows:

"(c) Postseason practice in basketball, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, volleyball and water polo shall be prohibited; however, it shall be permissible in each sport to assemble the squad for one day for purposes of taking squad pictures."

Source: University of Bridgeport, University of New Haven.

Action: See No. 57.

NO. 60 OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 57; Bylaw 3-2, as follows:

"O.I. 307. A 'postseason tournament' contest is one between teams that are not identified until the close of the preceding regular season, the term 'postseason' necessarily implying that the time of the event shall be after a regular season. If a conference conducts a regularly scheduled, season-end, single-elimination tournament or, in the sport of baseball, a regularly scheduled, season-end, double-elimination tournament, among some or all of its members then the game or games played by each team shall count as one of the permissible regular season contests or playing dates and the tournament shall not be considered postseason. Institutions which tie for a conference championship may participate in a single-elimination playoff to determine the conference's automatic entry in an NCAA tournament without the game or games being counted as a regular-season contest or postseason tournament."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Action: See No. 57.

NO. 61 SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(a), page 47, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II and Division III in football.]

"Section 2. Limitations on Out-of-Season Practice. (a) Post-season practice in football for members of Division I shall be limited to twenty sessions in a period of thirty-six calendar days (vacation and examination days excluded). Postseason practice in football for members of Division II and Division III shall be prohibited."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To abolish spring football practice for members of Division II and Division III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Division I delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy did not favor this proposal for Division I; Division II and Division III delegates unanimously recommended abolition of spring football practice in their divisions.]

Action: Approved by Division III as amended; tabled by Division II as amended (see No. 62).

NO. 62 SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 61; Bylaw 3-2-(a), page 49, as follows:

"Section 2. Limitations on Out-of-Season Practice. (a) Post-season practice in football for members of Division I shall be limited to twenty sessions in a period of thirty-six calendar days (vacation and examination days excluded). Postseason practice in football for members of Division II and Division III shall be prohibited. The Council may, by a two-thirds vote of its members present and voting, grant exceptions to these provisions for members of Division II or Division III if it deems that unusual scheduling circumstances warrant such action."

Source: Bishop College.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III.

NO. 63 OUT-OF-SEASON PARTICIPATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, by adding a new paragraph (i), page 47, as follows:

"(i) Member institutions may not enter student-athletes in out-of-season competition in the sports of cross country, fencing, golf, gymnastics, skiing, swimming, tennis, indoor track, outdoor track and wrestling and may not pay expenses for such competition in those sports. Student-athletes participating in such competition may do so at their own expense but may not compete as representatives of their institutions. Participation in NCAA championship events, Olympic and Pan American Games qualifying competition, foreign tours in accordance with Bylaw 3-3 or other international competition involving the national teams of the nations represented shall be exempted from the provisions of this paragraph."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit a member institution from paying expenses for a student-athlete to take part in out-of-season competition in the

sports listed except as noted, but permit a student-athlete to participate in such competition at his own expense and as an unattached entry.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: The Special Committee on Length of Season submitted this proposal to give meaning to the proposed limitations on season lengths set forth in Proposal No. 36, acknowledging that individual competition in these sports may continue outside of the prescribed institutional season but without institutional expense or representation.]

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 36.

NO. 64 OUT-OF-SEASON PARTICIPATION

Amend Proposal No. 63; Bylaw 3-1, as follows:

"(i) Member institutions may not enter student-athletes in out-of-season competition in the sports of cross country, fencing, golf, gymnastics, skiing, swimming, tennis, indoor track, outdoor track and wrestling and may not pay expenses for such competition in those sports. Student-athletes participating in such competition may do so at their own expense but may not compete as representatives of their institutions. Participation in NCAA championship events, **championship events conducted by the national governing body of the sport**, Olympic and Pan American Games qualifying competition, foreign tours in accordance with Bylaw 3-3 or other international competition involving the national teams of the nations represented shall be exempted from the provisions of this paragraph."

Source: Baruch College.

Action: Ruled out of order due to ruling on No. 63.

NO. 65 OUTSIDE PARTICIPATION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(d), page 18, as follows:

"(d) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in his sport *for the duration of the season*, if, following his enrollment in college and during any year in which he is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he competes or *has competed* as a member of any outside team **or as a member of his institution's extramural club team in any non-collegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity)** in his sport during his institution's *intercollegiate season* academic year. The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or to participate in other international competition involving the national teams of the nations represented. *The intercollegiate season in a sport shall be the period of time between opening of the institution's formal varsity practice and its last regularly scheduled game. The academic year shall be the period of time between the beginning of the fall term and the end of the spring term, excluding summer sessions or terms.*"

Source: Mid-American Conference.

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete shall not participate as a member of any outside team in his sport during any academic year in which he is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team in that sport; further, that a student-athlete may not participate on his institution's club team in extramural competition in his sport during any academic year in which he is or was a member of the institution's intercollegiate team in that sport, and to define "academic year" for purposes of this legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 66 FOOTBALL PLAYING SEASON

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(c), page 46, as follows:

"(c) The total playing schedule for any intercollegiate football team shall be limited in any one year to a maximum of **eleven twelve** contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition to be played during the traditional fall season, exclusive of one scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided that the game be with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students, or both, and exclusive of (i) one postseason game approved by the Association's Extra Events Committee or (ii) those games played in the National Collegiate Division II and Division III Football Championships."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To increase the number of permissible football contests by one.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 67 FOOTBALL PLAYING SEASON

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(c), page 46, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"(c) The total playing schedule for any intercollegiate football team shall be limited in any one year to a maximum of eleven contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition to be played during the traditional fall season, exclusive of one scrimmage or contest **with outside competition at the conclusion of during the spring practice period**, provided that the game be with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students, or both, be scheduled on an annual basis and involve competition between members of the same conference or between institutions located in the same general geographic area, and exclusive of (i) one postseason game approved by the Association's Extra Events Committee or (ii) those games played in the National Collegiate Division II and Division III Football Championships."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To permit one football game or scrimmage with another institution during the spring football practice period to provide additional revenue, increase interest in spring practice and aid in promoting college football and the sale of season tickets.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 68 EXTRA EVENTS FINANCES

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 4, Section 1-(a), page 106, as follows:

"(a) In accordance with Bylaw 2-2-(h), institutions competing in such contests the NCAA shall receive not less than seventy-five per cent of the gross receipts to be divided equally between them, out of which each may be required to pay its own traveling and other team expenses incidental to the game as follows:

"(1) Fifty per cent to be divided equally between the participating institutions, out of which each may be required to pay its own travel and other team expenses incidental to the game.

"(2) Twenty-five per cent to members who are in Division I in football.

"(3) Twelve and one-half per cent to members who are in Division II in football.

"(4) Twelve and one-half per cent to members who are in Division III in football."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To guarantee income from postseason football contests to all members who participate in football in Divisions I, II and III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Ruled out of order due to lack of authorization in Constitution. Convention sustained ruling when challenged by amendment's sponsor.

NO. 69 RESOLUTION: TELEVISION PLAN

"Be It Resolved, that the membership of the Association direct the NCAA Television Committee to specify, in the formulation of the next NCAA Television Plan and subsequent such Plans, that after providing incentives for participating institutions which shall not exceed fifteen per cent of the total Plan, the remaining net proceeds shall be prorated equally to member institutions as follows:

"(1) Fifty per cent to members who are in Division I in football.

"(2) Twenty-five per cent to members who are in Division II in football.

"(3) Twenty-five per cent to members who are in Division III in football."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Action: Chair ruled two-thirds vote necessary for approval. Ruling of chair challenged by amendment's sponsor and overturned by

Convention. Motion to table defeated. Amendment defeated.

NO. 70 DISTRIBUTION OF RECEIPTS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 10-(d), page 101, as follows:

"(d) Fifty per cent of the balance shall be distributed among the competing teams or other member institutions according to the following formulae:

"(2) Division I Basketball. A maximum of 152 units shall be awarded on the basis of two units per team for all games except that three units shall be awarded for the first game played by a team which received a first-round bye and three units per team shall be awarded for each game played at the finals. Prorated equally to all member institutions participating in inter-collegiate basketball in Division I.

Source: Pacific Coast Athletic Association.

Intent: To specify that the net receipts from the National Collegiate Basketball Championship shall be awarded equally to all Division I basketball-playing member institutions after payment of the participating institution's expenses, tournament administration expenses and payment to the general fund of the Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 71 AMENDMENTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 1-(a), page 87, as follows:

"(a) Each division of the Association may at any Convention, by a majority vote of the members of such division present and voting, adopt or amend any Bylaw not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution or this Section. Bylaws 6-4, 6-5, 6-6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 apply to the three divisions of the Association and thus any amendment of them must be adopted by all three divisions. The other Bylaw articles and sections may be amended by one or more divisions acting separately, and such legislation shall apply only to the division which adopts it."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that Bylaws 6-4, 6-5 and 6-6 are "common" Bylaws, apply to the three divisions and any amendment to them must be adopted by all divisions. (Bylaws 6-1, 6-2 and 6-3 may be amended by a division acting separately.) This proposal facilitates introduction of Proposals Nos. 72 and 73 regarding "terminal" championships in Division II and Division III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 72 TERMINAL CHAMPIONSHIPS IN DIVISION III

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 4-(d), page 68, as follows:

"(d) The Executive Regulations shall specify the number of individual student-athletes in Division II and Division III

Championships who may qualify for the National Collegiate Championships in the sports of cross country, golf, gymnastics, swimming, tennis, outdoor track and wrestling."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 4-(d), page 90, as follows:

"(d) Student-athletes from members of Division II or Division III who qualify to compete in the National Collegiate Championships under the provisions of Bylaw 6-4-(d) and the Executive Regulations shall meet all academic standards and eligibility requirements of Division I, including academic standards for initial participation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To stipulate that student-athletes from Division III Championships may not qualify to compete in the Division I Championships.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Division I delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy favored the terminal championship concept, and Division III delegates favored it for their division. Division II delegates were opposed to the proposal for their division.]

Action: Defeated by Division III; approved by Divisions I and II (includes common Bylaw and must be approved by all three divisions to become effective).

NO. 73 TERMINAL CHAMPIONSHIPS IN DIVISION II

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 4-(d), page 68, as follows:

"(d) The Executive Regulations shall specify the number of individual student-athletes in Division II and Division III Championships who may qualify for the National Collegiate Championships in the sports of cross country, golf, gymnastics, swimming, tennis, outdoor track and wrestling."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 4-(d), page 90, as follows:

"(d) Student-athletes from members of Division II or Division III who qualify to compete in the National Collegiate Championships under the provisions of Bylaw 6-4-(d) and the Executive Regulations shall meet all academic standards and eligibility requirements of Division I, including academic standards for initial participation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To stipulate that student-athletes from Division II Championships may not qualify to compete in the Division I Championships.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Division I delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy favored the terminal championship concept, and Division III delegates favored it for their division. Division II delegates were opposed to this proposal for their division. The NCAA Council voted to make the proposal available for Convention action by all divisions.]

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 74 IMPROPER EXPENSES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(3), page 9, as follows:

"(3) Payment of excessive or improper expense allowances, including, but not limited to, payment of (i) money to team members or individual competitors for unspecified or un-itemized expenses; (ii) expenses incurred by a student-athlete which are prohibited by the rules governing an amateur non-college event in which the student-athlete participates; or (iii) expenses incurred by a student-athlete competing in an event which occurs at a time when he is not regularly enrolled in a full-time program of studies during the regular academic year, or not eligible to represent his institution, except that expenses may be paid for a student-athlete to compete only in regularly scheduled intercollegiate events and established national championships occurring between terms and during the summer months, provided he is representing his institution and was eligible for intercollegiate competition the preceding term, and in international competition approved by the NCAA Council, or (iv) expenses for organized off-campus, pre-game housing for athletic teams for home games or other games for which the team normally would travel to the site the day of the game."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that a member institution may not provide organized, special housing for its teams before home games or games at nearby sites.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Division III delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy recommended this proposal; Division II delegates indicated support but did not specify any games other than home games, and Division I delegates opposed the proposal.]

Action: Defeated, 241-159 (two-thirds required for approval).

NO. 75 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES

Constitution: Delete Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(6), page 11, and re-number subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(6) An institution may provide travel uniforms to its student-athletes which shall not exceed slacks and a sport coat or jacket marked with the institution's name, insignia or initials. During the student-athlete's college career, the travel uniform shall be checked in and out in the same manner as the game uniform. The travel uniform may be given to the student-athlete upon completion of his eligibility."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit a member institution from providing travel uniforms to its student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Division I delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy did not favor this proposal; Division II and Division III delegates approved it.]

Action: Approved as amended, 282-140 (see No. 76).

NO. 76 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES

Amend Proposal No. 75; Constitution 3-1-(h)-(6), as follows:

Effective Date: "Immediately August 1, 1976."

Source: Southeastern Conference.

Action: Approved.

NO. 77 ATHLETIC AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(7), page 11, as follows:

"(7) Individual intercollegiate athletic awards and similar mementos to student-athletes shall be limited to those approved or administered by the member institution, or a member conference, in keeping with the following requirements:

"(i) Institutional awards for recognition of freshman or varsity intercollegiate athletic participation *may include letter sweaters, letter jackets, sport blazers and blankets with appropriate institutional insignia or letter, watches or rings with institutional insignia or comparable identification, scrolls and plaques. In addition, senior awards as listed above may be presented. shall be limited to an institutional insignia, letter or certificate. No other award may be provided by the member institution but may be purchased by the student-athlete at the prevailing retail price.*"

[Subparagraphs (ii) through (v) remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that the only official athletic participation award which may be provided by a member institution is the institution's insignia, letter or certificate and that any other type of award (e.g., letter sweaters, jackets, blazers, blankets, watches, rings, scrolls and plaques) must be purchased by the student-athlete or persons upon whom he is naturally or legally dependent.

Effective Date: Immediately.

[NOTE: Division II delegates to the NCAA Meeting on Economy favored this proposal; Division I and Division III delegates did not.]

Action: Defeated.

NO. 78 ATHLETIC AWARDS

Amend Proposal No. 77; Constitution 3-1-(h)-(7), as follows:

"(i) Institutional awards for recognition of freshman or varsity intercollegiate athletic participation *shall be limited to may include an institutional insignia, letter or certificate, letter sweaters, letter jackets or sport blazers. No other award may be provided by the member institution but may be purchased by the student-athlete at the prevailing retail price.*"

Source: University of the Pacific.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 79 COMPLIMENTARY TICKETS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(4), page 9, as follows:

"(4) Awarding complimentary tickets in excess of *four two* per student-athlete per contest **in which he appears in uniform to participate**, and awarding complimentary tickets to student-athletes in sports other than those in which the student-athlete is a participant. It is not permissible for an institution to repurchase the complimentary tickets awarded to its student-athletes."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To limit the award of complimentary tickets to a maximum of two and to specify that they may be awarded only to those student-athletes dressed to participate in the contest for which the tickets are awarded.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

Appendix B

70th ANNUAL CONVENTION

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1975-76 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 70th Convention took some action appear in this appendix.*]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

70th ANNUAL CONVENTION

Proposal Numbers General Topic

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| 100 through 125 | Financial Aid |
| 126 through 175 | Personnel and Squad Limitations |
| 176 through 212 | Recruiting |
| 213 through 219 | Compliance and Enforcement |
| 220 through 242 | Membership and Divisions |
| 243 through 263 | Eligibility |
| 264 through 274 | Playing and Practice Seasons |
| 275 through 303 | Miscellaneous |
| 304 through 324 | Executive Regulations |

NO. 100 DETERMINATION OF FINANCIAL NEED

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1, page 62, as follows:

"Section 1. Division III Exemption. Division III members shall be exempt from compliance with all provisions of this Article except Section 9."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5 by adding new Section 9, page 66, as follows:

"Section 9. Determination of Financial Need. To be eligible to represent his institution in intercollegiate athletic competition, a student-athlete shall not be the recipient of financial aid (for which his athletic ability is considered in any degree) in excess of the permissible maximum amount determined by application of the provisions of this Section.

"(a) Each member institution shall file with the NCAA a statement of its educational equivalent. If the educational equivalent of a member differs between and among divisions

of an institution, it shall file a statement of the educational equivalent for each subdivision for which there is enrolled a student-athlete. The educational equivalent is defined as tuition and mandatory fees, room and board at campus rates for double occupancy, required course-related books (in kind but not in cash) not in excess of one hundred fifty dollars per academic year. Revised statements shall be filed whenever there is a change in the respective amounts and shall indicate the academic year in which the statement applies.

"(b) A member institution may award tuition and mandatory fees, or part thereof, to a student-athlete without regard to his financial need, but an award shall not cover any other part of his educational equivalent except upon a showing of financial need by the recipient. Upon a showing of such need, the institution may award financial aid to the student-athlete to cover any part of the educational equivalent (in addition to tuition and mandatory fees) which exceeds the student-athlete's calculated Expected Family Contribution.

"(c) When a scholarship or grant-in-aid is awarded to a student and the recipient's athletic ability was considered in any degree in determining the award, such financial aid combined with other aid or income the student may receive from employment during semester or term time, other scholarships or grants-in-aid (including governmental grants for educational purposes) and like sources, together with the computed Expected Family Contribution, shall not exceed the educational equivalent as defined above. Bona fide loans which must be paid in full, not related in any way to the borrower's athletic ability, are not a required component in determining the aid limit.

"(d) The Council shall adopt a formula (see Appendices C and D) for determining the Expected Family Contribution on the basis of income of the student, his spouse (if any) and his parents (or guardians), excluding wage or salary income of the student.

"(e) The Council shall approve a form (see Appendix E) to secure information needed to make the calculation of the Expected Family Contribution. The form shall permit explanation of extraordinary situations which the student wishes considered in the calculation. The form shall be submitted to the NCAA, or its designated agent, which shall determine the Expected Family Contribution and advise the student of the figure thus established. The figure shall be revealed to such member institutions as the student directs, and such institutions may offer or award aid as provided above in accordance with the stated figure.

"(f) The information in the form shall be kept confidential by the NCAA, or its designated agent, except to the extent that the information may be material to questions of violation of NCAA requirements.

"(g) In the event of a change of economic circumstances of those whose income is considered in calculating the Expected

Family Contribution, the student may secure a new calculation by following the procedure utilized in determining his original calculation. The result of the new calculation shall be similarly revealed. After the student has entered the institution, an award may be adjusted if a new calculation establishes a change in need.

"(h) A member institution may award financial aid on the basis of need established by any other procedure it chooses, provided such aid shall not exceed the maximum amount permitted by the NCAA formula and the institution so certifies to the NCAA.

"(i) The Council may establish such further procedures as it deems desirable, adopt appropriate additional forms, fix fees for supplying forms or providing statements of the calculated Expected Family Contribution, authorize preparation and supplying of instructions on the use of forms or on the procedures and of informational pamphlets and otherwise implement the provisions of this Section. Such acts of the Council may be passed on by the annual Convention in the manner provided for review of interpretations in Constitution 6-2."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To propose procedures for awarding financial aid on the basis of the individual recipient's need in accordance with the resolution (No. 6) adopted by the 2nd Special NCAA Convention.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976, for those student-athletes first entering member institutions subsequent to the opening term (semester or quarter) of the 1976-77 academic year.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions in the following sequence: Motion for roll call vote approved, 253-203. Motion to table withdrawn while roll call vote on tabling was in progress. No. 100-A defeated by Division III, exempting that division for further action on No. 100. Divisions I and II voted, 237-114, to reconsider the motion for a roll call vote. Division I defeated motion for roll call, 99-124; Division II also defeated the motion. Voting on the proposal itself, Division I voted, 119-119, and subsequently defeated the proposal in a roll call vote, 112-120, with five abstentions. Division II defeated the proposal, 48-75 (also see Nos. 100-1 and 100-2, Appendix E). The roll call vote in Division I is listed in Appendix J.

NO. 101 FINANCIAL AID

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f)-(1), page 8, as follows:

"(1) In the event such aid exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related books) during the undergraduate career of the recipient, it shall be considered 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics; except if such aid is based upon financial need as determined by the financial aids office, it shall

not be considered 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics."

B. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 505-(a), following Bylaw 5-8, page 65, by adding the following new paragraph:

"Aid granted in excess of commonly accepted educational expenses which is based on need as determined by the financial aid office shall not be counted in administering the equivalencies procedure."

Source: California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive aid based on need in excess of "commonly accepted educational expenses" and to specify that such excess aid shall not be counted in determining equivalencies.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 102 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(2), page 15, as follows:

"(2) Governmental grants for educational purposes, except (i) benefits received by student-athletes under the G.I. Bill of Rights; (ii) payments to student-athletes for participation in military reserve training programs (for example, payments by the U.S. Government for a student's participation in advanced ROTC or National Guard training shall not be construed under this principle to be 'employment' during semester or term time); or (iii) payments by the U.S. Government under the terms of the War Orphans Educational Program, Social Security Insurance Program or Non-Service-Connected Veteran's Death Pension Program, or (iv) Federal or state government-sponsored grants, such as the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, which are administered by a member institution and which are awarded without any regard to the student's athletic ability."

Source: Canisius College.

Intent: To exclude government grants, including the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, from being considered as part of the maximum allowable financial aid under Constitution 3-1-(f).

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 103 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(2), page 15, as follows:

"(2) Governmental grants for educational purposes, except (i) benefits received by student-athletes under the G.I. Bill of Rights; (ii) payments to student-athletes for participation in military reserve training programs (for example, payments by the U.S. Government for a student's participation in advanced ROTC or National Guard training shall not be construed under this principle to be 'employment' during semester or term time); or (iii) payments by the U.S. Government under the

terms of the War Orphans Educational Program, Social Security Insurance Program or Non-Service-Connected Veteran's Death Pension Program, or (iv) Basic Economic Opportunity Grants (BEOG) provided the BEOG total, when combined with financial aid based on athletic ability, does not exceed the cost of education as defined in the institution's catalogue."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To exempt BEOG awards from being included in the computation of the maximum allowable financial aid under Constitution 3-1-(f).

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 104 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f)-(1), page 8, as follows:

"(1) In the event such aid exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books and incidental expenses not in excess of fifteen dollars per month) during the undergraduate career of the recipient, it shall be considered 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics."

Source: Big Eight Conference, Pennsylvania State University, Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To reinstate incidental expenses in the definition of "commonly accepted educational expenses."

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 105 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f)-(1), page 8, as follows:

"(1) In the event such aid exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related supplies and books) during the undergraduate career of the recipient, it shall be considered 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics."

Source: Big Eight Conference, Pennsylvania State University.

Intent: To reinstate course-related supplies in the definition of "commonly accepted educational expenses."

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 106 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f)-(1), page 8, as follows:

"(1) In the event such aid exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related books) during the undergraduate career of the recipient, it shall be considered 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics. (Effective 8/15/75; for those student-

athletes first entering member institutions and for all renewals of financial aid subsequent to the fall term, 1975-76 academic year.)"

Source: Providence College.

Intent: To specify that student-athletes currently enrolled in a member institution will not be affected during the remainder of their college eligibility by the contraction of the definition of "commonly accepted educational expenses."

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Not introduced.

NO. 107 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (j), page 13, as follows:

"(j) A student-athlete may not receive a written offer of financial aid from an institution until he has applied for admission to the institution. His application for admission shall involve the same procedures generally required for students who seek admission to the institution as undergraduates."

Source: Stanford University; University of California, Berkeley.

Intent: To eliminate the practice of sending letters of intent or other written offers of financial aid to prospective student-athletes before they have applied for admission.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated, 229-179 (two-thirds required for approval).

NO. 108 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f)-(2), page 8, as follows:

"(2) Financial aid may not be provided a student-athlete while attending a summer school or summer term unless he has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year and then such financial aid may be utilized only to attend for utilization at any other institution except the awarding institution's for a summer term or summer school."

Source: Seton Hall University.

Intent: To permit an institution to award financial aid to student-athletes for summer school programs during the summer prior to their freshman year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 109 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(2), pages 8-9, as follows:

"(2) Graduation or cancellation of institutional aid during the period of its award on the basis of (i) a student-athlete's ability or his contribution to a team's success; (ii) because of an injury which prevents the recipient from participating in athletics, or (iii) for any other athletic reason.

"Aid may be gradated or cancelled if the recipient (iv) renders himself ineligible for intercollegiate competition; or (v) fraudulently misrepresents any information on his application, letter-of-intent or tender; or (vi) engages in serious misconduct warranting substantial disciplinary penalty, or (vii) voluntarily withdraws from a sport for his own personal reasons. Any such gradation or cancellation of aid is permissible only if such action is taken for proper cause by the regular disciplinary or scholarship awards authorities of the institution and the student-athlete has had an opportunity for a hearing. Under (vii) above, such gradation or cancellation of aid may *not occur prior to the conclusion of that academic year occur at the end of the term.*"

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To permit the withdrawal of a grant-in-aid for a student-athlete who voluntarily withdraws from a sport for his own personal reasons at the end of that term.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved.

NO. 110 FINANCIAL AID

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f)-(1), page 8, as follows:

"(1) In the event such aid exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related books) during the undergraduate career [the five-year period defined in Constitution 3-9-(a)] of the recipient, it shall be considered 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that financial aid described in Constitution 3-1-(f) is limited to a maximum period of five years.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 111 EXEMPTED PLAYERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 4-(c), page 62, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(c) He was recruited, but does not receive financial aid based upon his athletic ability or as set forth in O.I. 500."

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To exempt from the counting procedure a recruited athlete who is receiving financial aid not based upon his athletic ability.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 112 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(a) and (b), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(a) Division I—In each sport, except football and basketball, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upperclassmen; further, the total number (based on equivalencies) of financial aid awards in effect at any one time for all sports, except football and basketball, shall not exceed the maximum limit of eighty. (Effective 8/1/76; **not applicable to those student-athletes who were enrolled in a Division I member institution prior to August 15, 1975.**)

"(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time: Total for all sports—Eighty; Baseball—Thirteen; Cross Country/Track—Fourteen; Fencing—Five; Golf—Five; Gymnastics—Seven; Ice Hockey—Twenty; Lacrosse—Fourteen; Skiing—Seven; Soccer—Eleven; Swimming—Eleven; Tennis—Five; Volleyball—Five; Water Polo—Five; Wrestling—Eleven. (Effective 8/1/76; **not applicable to those student-athletes who were enrolled in a Division I institution prior to August 15, 1975.**)"

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To allow for a gradual process in reducing grants-in-aid in sports other than football and basketball, enabling an institution to award aid to incoming prospects in those sports without jeopardizing continuation of aid to student-athletes enrolled prior to August 15, 1975.

Effective Date: As noted.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 113 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(a) and (b), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(a) Division I—In each sport, except football and basketball, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upperclassmen; further, the total number (based on equivalencies) of financial aid awards in effect at any one time for all sports, except football and basketball, shall not exceed the maximum limit of eighty. (Effective 8/1/76 8/1/77.)

"(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time: Total for all sports—Eighty; Baseball—Thirteen; Cross Country/Track—Fourteen; Fencing—Five; Golf—Five; Gymnastics—Seven; Ice Hockey—Twenty; Lacrosse—Fourteen; Skiing—Seven; Soccer—Eleven; Swimming—Eleven; Tennis—Five; Volleyball—Five; Water Polo—Five; Wrestling—Eleven. (Effective 8/1/76 8/1/77.)"

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To delay the effective date of the reduced maximum award limitations in sports other than football and basketball for one year.

Effective Date: As noted.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 114 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(c), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"(c) Division I Football—There shall be an annual limit on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year, including initial awards. The following limitations are applicable: Thirty maximum initial awards per year. Ninety-five maximum awards in effect the same year."

Source: University of South Carolina.

Intent: To eliminate the limitation on the number of awards which may be in effect in the same year in the sport of football while retaining the present limitation of 30 initial awards per year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Division I football.

NO. 115 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(c), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"(c) Division I Football—There shall be an annual limit on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes and there shall be an annual limit on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year, including initial awards. The following limitations are applicable: Thirty maximum initial awards per year. Ninety-five maximum awards in effect the same year. (Effective 8/15/75; member institutions shall conform to the limit of 95 for the 1977-78 1978-79 academic year.)

Source: University of Nebraska.

Intent: To delay the effective date of the overall maximum award limitation in the sport of football for one year.

Effective Date: As noted.

Action: Defeated by Division I football.

NO. 116 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(d), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(d) Division I Basketball—There shall be an annual limit on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made

to student-athletes and there shall be a limit on the total number of initial awards which may be made in any two-year period. Further, there shall be an annual limit on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year, including initial awards. The following limitations are applicable: Six maximum initial awards per year. Ten maximum initial awards in any two-year period. Fifteen maximum awards in effect the same year."

Source: Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To eliminate initial awards in the sport of basketball while retaining the present limitation of 15 awards which may be in effect in the same year.

Effective Date: Immediately; member institutions shall conform to the limit of 15 for the 1977-78 academic year.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 117 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(b), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time: Gymnastics—Seven Ten;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: University of Michigan.

Intent: To increase the maximum awards limitation in gymnastics from seven to ten.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 118 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(b), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(b) Division I. Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time: Swimming—Eleven Fourteen;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Indiana University.

Intent: To increase from 11 to 14 the number of awards which may be in effect at any one time in the sport of swimming in Division I.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 119 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(b), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which

may be in effect at any one time: Tennis—*Five Six*;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Texas Christian University, Pan American University.

Intent: To increase the maximum awards limitation in tennis from five to six.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 120 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(b), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time: Wrestling—*Eleven Five maximum initial awards per year; eight maximum initial awards in any consecutive two-year period; eleven maximum awards in effect the same year.*" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To establish initial awards in wrestling and specify limitations on such awards.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 121 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(f), page 63, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II in football.]

"(f) Division II—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time: Football—*Sixty Forty-five*;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To reduce the number of financial aid awards (based on equivalencies) in the sport of football in Division II from 60 to 45.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Tabled by Division II football.

NO. 122 MULTIPLE SPORT PARTICIPANTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 64, as follows:

"Section 6. Multiple Sport Participants. A player who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and *practices or competes engages in varsity competition* in football and one or more other sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football. A player who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and *practices or competes engages in varsity competition* in basketball and one or more other sports (other than football) shall be counted in the sport of basketball. A

player in two or more sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in one of the sports, but need not be counted in the other."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To exempt from the counting procedures in football and basketball the multiple sport participants who practice with the varsity and/or who compete in sub-varsity competition in football and basketball.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 123 MULTIPLE SPORT PARTICIPANTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 64, as follows:

"Section 6. Multiple Sport Participants. A player who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and practices or competes in football and one or more other sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football. A player who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and practices or competes in basketball and one or more other sports (other than football) shall be counted in the sport of basketball. A player in two or more sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in one of the sports, but need not be counted in the other, **except that a player who practices or competes in both swimming and water polo shall be counted in the sport of swimming.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a participant in both swimming and water polo to be counted in the sport of swimming.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by Division I, 103-61; defeated by Division II.

NO. 124 FINANCIAL AID DEFINITION

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 500, following Bylaw 5-8, page 64, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"O.I. 500. The term 'financial aid' as used in Bylaw 5 includes all institutional funds such as scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, and on-campus employment, and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient, as well as off-campus employment earnings and other sources of aid during the academic year for which the athletic interests of the institution intercede in behalf of the recipient; except that legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students, and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary

funds for a previously determined recipient shall not be considered accountable financial aid when determining the equivalency percentage."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To exempt non-institutional monies (e.g., SEOG, Model Cities, Pullman Foundation, etc.) from inclusion when computing the equivalency factor for sports other than football and basketball.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 125 FINANCIAL AID—EQUIVALENCIES

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 505-(a), following Bylaw 5-8, page 65, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(a) With respect to sports other than football or basketball in Division I, and with respect to all sports in Division II, a member institution may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of value (equivalency) so long as the total dollar amount expended does not exceed the value of "commonly accepted educational expenses" at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sport in its division. The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:

"The institution shall count the actual amount of money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for room, board, tuition and fees as well as books (which may not exceed one hundred fifty dollars per academic year; in cases where books are required to be returned by the student-athlete to the institution, this limitation shall be based on the net cost of the books to the institution)." [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To establish that the limitation on expenses for books shall be on the net cost to the university as indicated.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 126 COACHING STAFFS

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, page 92, by deleting all of Section 1.

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To rescind the limitations on number of coaches.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II, 59-40; defeated by Division I.

NO. 127 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"Section 1. Number of Coaches. A member institution shall not employ or otherwise utilize the services of coaches in excess of the following numbers: the specified numbers, except that these limitations shall not apply in those sports at institutions where coaching staffs serve both men and women student-athletes in intercollegiate athletic programs, provided that the difference between the total number of coaches thus employed per sport, or sports, and the number, or numbers, specified below is commensurate with the magnitude of the women's intercollegiate program in the sport or sports. [Note: Division III members shall be exempt from compliance with all provisions of this Section.]"

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To remove limitations on the number of coaches in those sports where the coaches serve both men and women, provided the described conditions are met.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 128 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1-(d), page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II.]

"(d) Division II Basketball—One head coach, one two assistant or part-time assistant coaches."

Source: California State University, Chico; California State University, Hayward; California State University, Sacramento; University of California, Davis.

Intent: To increase the permissible number of basketball coaches in Division II institutions.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 126.

NO. 129 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (e), page 92, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II in football.]

"(e) If a member institution sponsors more than one intercollegiate football team, that member institution may employ or otherwise utilize two additional part-time coaches in the sport of football. Coaches employed or otherwise utilized for the purposes of this paragraph are prohibited from off-campus recruiting. Such additional teams must participate in four or more intercollegiate contests."

Source: Ivy Group.

Intent: To permit additional part-time coaches for junior varsity, freshman or other subvarsity football teams.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by Division I; out of order for Division II due to action on No. 126.

NO. 130 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 1200, following Bylaw 12-1-(d), page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"O.I. 1200. The limitations of this Section do not apply to lightweight football programs. Coaches of lightweight football programs are prohibited from off-campus recruiting in the sport of football."

Source: Ivy Group.

Intent: To establish that the limitation on number of football coaches is not applicable to lightweight football programs.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by Division I; out of order for Division II due to action on No. 126.

NO. 131 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1-(e), page 92, as follows.

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(e) No individual other than those specified in the applicable paragraph above may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution during any game, practice or other organized activity in football or basketball, except that a member institution may permit uncompensated volunteers to participate in such coaching provided **they are registered graduate students no more than one such person is involved in a sport, he they** receive no compensation or remuneration of any sort, including expenses, from the institution's department of athletics and **he is they are** not permitted to recruit or scout off campus;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Springfield College.

Intent: To permit an unlimited number of registered graduate students to coach under the specified conditions.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 132 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (f), page 92, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II.]

"(f) A Division II member institution may permit any number of uncompensated volunteers to participate in such coach-

ing provided each such volunteer is a registered graduate student in that institution, receives no compensation or remuneration of any sort, including expenses, from the institution's department of athletics and is not permitted to recruit or scout off campus or travel with the team."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit Division II institutions to use an unlimited number of volunteer graduate student coaches under the specified conditions, in addition to the possible use of one non-student volunteer as provided in Bylaw 12-1-(e).

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 126.

NO. 133 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (f), page 92, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(f) An individual who is a graduate of that university, and in his fifth year, may assist in coaching only without being subject to these limitations if his remuneration is limited to normal educational expenses."

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To permit a graduate of an institution in his fifth year to participate in coaching without counting in the limitations and to receive remuneration not to exceed normal educational expenses.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by Division I; out of order for Division II due to action on No. 126.

NO. 134 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1-(i), page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(i) These limitations on the number of coaches do not apply in circumstances where academic tenure, enforceable contracts or formal security of employment commitments in effect on August 15, 1975, make it impossible to comply with the limitations. These exceptions are continued until normal attrition makes it possible to comply with these limitations. Normal attrition shall be defined as voluntary resignation by the employee or discharge for cause or purposeful non-renewal of a contract by the employer institution."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To define "normal attrition" for the purposes of this paragraph.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended (see No. 134-1, Appendix E); out of order for Division II due to action on No. 126.

NO. 135 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1-(i), page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(i) These limitations on the number of coaches do not apply in circumstances where academic tenure, enforceable contracts or formal security of employment commitments in effect on August 15, 1975, make it impossible to comply with the limitations. These exceptions are continued until normal attrition makes it possible to comply with these limitations. In all other cases, compliance with these coaching staff limitations shall be by normal attrition, with final adjustment achieved by August 1, 1979."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To establish an adjustment period for institutions and staff members in reaching compliance with limitations on coaching staffs.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Division I; out of order for Division II due to action on No. 126.

NO. 136 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 12, Section 1, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(All of Section 1 effective 8/1/76 8/1/78.)"

Source: Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To delay the effective date for limitations on coaching staffs by two years.

Effective Date: As noted.

Action: Defeated by Division I; out of order for Division II due to action on No. 126.

NO. 137 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 12, Section 1, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(All of Section 1 effective 8/1/76 8/1/77.)"

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To delay the effective date for limitations on coaching staffs by one year.

Effective Date: As noted.

Action: Defeated by Division I, 81-93; out of order for Division II due to action on No. 126.

NO. 138 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12 by deleting all of Section 2, page 92.

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference, Pennsylvania State Colleges Athletic Conference. In addition, the following Division III members submitted the proposal for their division: Amherst College, Babson College, Bates College, Boston State College, Bowdoin College, Brandeis University, California Institute of Technology, Claremont-Mudd Colleges, Colby College, Connecticut College, Franklin and Marshall College, Haverford College, Hope College, Keene State College, University of Lowell, University of Maine at Portland-Gorham, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Middle Atlantic States College Athletic Conference, Nichols College, North Central College, Occidental College, Oswego State University College, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges, University of Redlands, Rhode Island College, University of Rochester, Southeastern Massachusetts University, Swarthmore College, Trinity College, Tufts University, U.S. Coast Guard Academy, Union College, Western New England College, Whittier College, Williams College and Worcester State College.

Intent: To rescind the limitations on size of traveling and home squads in all sports in all divisions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III; defeated by Division I, 90-124.

NO. 139 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

"Section 2. Size of Traveling and Home Squad. There shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to varsity competition being held away from the institution's home facility, and there shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may dress for or participate in varsity competition being conducted at the institution's home facility. The following table of squad size limitations is applicable:"

[NOTE: Home squad limitations would be eliminated from the Squad Size Limitations table.]

Source: Big Eight Conference, Big Ten Conference, Eastern College Athletic Conference, University of Notre Dame, Southeastern Conference, Western Athletic Conference. The NCAA Council voted to sponsor this proposal for Divisions II and III.

Intent: To eliminate limitations on the size of home squads in all sports in all divisions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I, 109-98; out of order for Divisions II and III due to action on No. 138.

NO. 140 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

"Section 2. Size of Traveling and Home Squad. There shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel

to varsity competition being held away from the institution's home facility, and there **There** shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may dress for or participate in varsity competition being conducted at the institution's home facility. The following table of squad size limitations is applicable."

[NOTE: Travel squad limitations would be eliminated from the Squad Size Limitations table.]

Source: Western Athletic Conference, Southeastern Conference.

Intent: To eliminate limitations on the size of travel squads in all sports in all divisions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I; out of order for Divisions II and III due to action on No. 138.

NO. 141 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

"Section 2. Size of Traveling and Home Squad. In the sports of football and basketball only, there shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to varsity competition being held away from the institution's home facility, and there shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may dress for or participate in varsity competition being conducted at the institution's home facility. The following table of squad size limitations is applicable."

[NOTE: All travel and home squad limitations would be eliminated from the Squad Size Limitations table except football and basketball.]

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To eliminate limitations on size of traveling and home squads in all sports except football and basketball in all divisions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Rule out of order due to actions on Nos. 138, 139, 140.

NO. 142 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 92, as follows:

"(a) The limitations provided for in this Section shall not apply to intraconference games or contests."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To exempt intraconference games or contests from squad limitation regulations.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 143 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 92, as follows:

"(a) Each institution shall have the authority to designate its home facility for its home athletic contests for the purposes of squad size limitations."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To permit each member institution to designate its "home facility" in regard to the squad size limitations for travel and home squads.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 144 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 92, as follows:

"(a) Each member institution shall maintain squad lists for each intercollegiate game or contest in accordance with these squad size limitations. No change in a travel squad list shall be permitted once a trip begins to competition away from the institution's home facility, and no change in a home squad list shall be permitted once the home team appears in uniform at the site of the competition."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that institutions must maintain and adhere to squad lists in accordance with the squad size limitations.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 145 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

"Section 2. Size of Traveling and Home Squad. There shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to varsity competition being held away from the institution's home facility, and there shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may dress for or participate in varsity competition being conducted at the institution's home facility. The squad limitations imposed by this Section shall not apply to a member institution's participation in NCAA championship events, postseason football games or international competition taking place either in the United States or a foreign country."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To exclude the competitions listed from application of the squad size limitations.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 146 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 92, as follows:

"(a) When competition is between or among teams with home facilities located in the same city, all such teams may use the home squad limit provided the contest is played in that city."

Source: Oral Roberts University.

Intent: To permit teams located in the same city to use the home squad limitation for competitions held in that city.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 147 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"Section 2. Size of Traveling and Home Squad. There shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to varsity competition being held away from the institution's home facility, and there shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may dress for or participate in varsity competition being conducted at the institution's home facility. In Division I the permissible number of participants on the home squad shall be identical with the number permitted on the travel squad in each sport. The following table of squad size limitations is applicable:" [NOTE: the table below lists only Division I limitations.]

| Sport | Squad Size | Travel Squad | Home Squad |
|---------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Baseball | 21 | 18 | 23 |
| Basketball | 12 | 10 | 13 |
| Cross Country | 9 | 9 | 11 |
| Fencing | 12 | 12 | 15 |
| Football | 52 | 48 | 60 |
| Golf | 7 | 6 | 8 |
| Gymnastics | 12 | 12 | 13 |
| Ice Hockey | 22 | 20 | 25 |
| Lacrosse | 24 | 24 | 30 |
| Skiing | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Soccer | 18 | 18 | 23 |
| Swimming | 18 | 18 | 23 |
| Tennis | 8 | 7 | 9 |
| Indoor Track | 25 | 22 | 28 |
| Outdoor Track | 30 | 27 | 34 |
| Volleyball | 10 | 10 | 13 |
| Water Polo | 14 | 12 | 15 |
| Wrestling | 13 | 12 | 15 |

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To establish one squad size number for travel and home squads in each sport in Division I.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 148 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Amend Proposal No. 147; Bylaw 12-2, as follows:

"Cross Country 9 10. Fencing 12 14. Football 52 54. Gymnastics 12 13. Swimming 18 20. Volleyball 10 12. Water Polo 14 15."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 149 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

| Sport | Travel Squad | Home Squad |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Baseball | 18 21 | 23 Unlimited |
| Basketball | 10 12 | 13 Unlimited |
| Cross Country | 9 11 | 11 Unlimited |
| Fencing | 12 | 15 Unlimited |
| Football | 48 52 | 60 Unlimited |
| Golf | 6 7 | 8 Unlimited |
| Gymnastics | 12 | 13 Unlimited |
| Ice Hockey | 20 | 25 20 |
| Lacrosse | 24 | 30 Unlimited |
| Skiing | 12 | 12 Unlimited |
| Soccer | 18 | 23 |
| Swimming | 18 24 | 23 Unlimited |
| Tennis | 7 9 | 9 Unlimited |
| Indoor Track | 22 2 x No. of events | 28 2xNo. of events |
| Outdoor Track | 27 2 x No. of events | 34 2xNo. of events |
| Volleyball | 10 | 13 Unlimited |
| Water Polo | 12 | 15 Unlimited |
| Wrestling | 12 12 dual | 15 12 dual |
| | 14 triangular or quadrangular | 14 triangular or quadrangular |

Source: Ivy Group.

Intent: To increase or otherwise modify the Division I travel and home squad limitations in each sport as indicated.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 150 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division II. Travel Squad. Basketball 10 12. Skiing 8 12. Indoor Track 22 25. Outdoor Track 27 30. Water Polo 12 14."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To increase the travel squad limitations as indicated in basketball, skiing, indoor track, outdoor track and water polo in Division II.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 151 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division III. Travel Squad. Baseball 18 21. Ice Hockey 20 22. Soccer 18 23. Tennis 7 8. Indoor Track 22 25. Outdoor Track 27 30. Water Polo 12 14. Wrestling 12 13."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To increase the travel squad limitations as indicated in baseball, ice hockey, soccer, tennis, indoor track, outdoor track, water polo and wrestling in Division III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 152 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

"Section 2. Size of Traveling and Home Squad. There shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to varsity competition being held away from the institution's home facility, and there shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may dress for or participate in varsity competition being conducted at the institution's home facility. The permissible number of participants on the home squad shall be identical with the number permitted on the travel squad in each sport. The following table of squad size limitations is applicable:

SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

| | Home and Travel Squad | | | Home Squad | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| | Div. I | Div. II | Div. III | Div. I | Div. II | Div. III |
| Baseball | 18 21 | 18 21 | 18 21 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Basketball | 10 12 | 10 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Cross Country | 9 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Fencing | 12 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Football | 48 52 | 48 52 | 48 52 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Golf | 6 7 | 6 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Gymnastics | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Ice Hockey | 20 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 25 | — |
| Lacrosse | 24 | 24 | 24 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Skiing | 12 | 8 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Soccer | 18 23 | 18 23 | 18 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Swimming | 18 24 | 18 24 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Tennis | 7 8 | 7 8 | 7 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Indoor Track | 22 25 | 22 25 | 22 25 | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| Outdoor Track | 27 30 | 27 30 | 27 30 | 34 | 34 | 34 |
| Volleyball | 10 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 13 | 13 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|----|
| Water Polo | 12 14 | 12 14 | 12 14 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Wrestling | 12 13 | 12 13 | 12 13 | 15 | 15 | 15 |

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference, University of Connecticut, LeMoyne College.

Intent: To establish one squad size number for travel and home squads in each sport and in each division as indicated.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 153 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

| | Travel Squad | | | Home Squad | | |
|---------------|--------------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| | Div. I | Div. II | Div. III | Div. I | Div. II | Div. III |
| Baseball | 18 21 | 18 21 | 18 21 | 23 21 | 23 21 | 23 21 |
| Basketball | 10 12 | 10 12 | 12 | 13 12 | 13 12 | 13 12 |
| Cross Country | 9 11 | 9 11 | 9 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Fencing | 12 | 12 | 12 | 15 12 | 15 12 | 15 12 |
| Football | 48 52 | 48 52 | 48 52 | 60 52 | 60 52 | 60 52 |
| Golf | 6 7 | 6 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Gymnastics | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 12 | 13 12 | 13 12 |
| Ice Hockey | 20 | 20 | 20 | 25 20 | 25 20 | — 20 |
| Lacrosse | 24 | 24 | 24 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Skiing | 12 | 8 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Soccer | 18 23 | 18 23 | 18 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Swimming | 18 24 | 18 24 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Tennis | 7 8 | 7 8 | 7 8 | 9 8 | 9 8 | 9 8 |
| Indoor Track | 22 25 | 22 25 | 22 25 | 28 25 | 28 25 | 28 25 |
| Outdoor Track | 27 30 | 27 30 | 27 30 | 34 30 | 34 30 | 34 30 |
| Volleyball | 10 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Water Polo | 12 14 | 12 14 | 12 14 | 15 14 | 15 14 | 15 14 |
| Wrestling | 12 15 | 12 15 | 12 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference, University of Connecticut, LeMoyne College.

Intent: To revise the limitations on travel and home squad sizes in all divisions as indicated.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 154 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

| | Travel Squad | | | Home Squad | | |
|------------|--------------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| | Div. I | Div. II | Div. III | Div. I | Div. II | Div. III |
| Baseball | 18 21 | 18 21 | 18 21 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Basketball | 10 12 | 10 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 13 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Cross Country | 9 | | 9 | | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 9 |
| Fencing | 12 | | 12 | | 12 | 15 | | 15 | | 15 | |
| Football | 48 | 52 | 48 | 52 | 48 | 52 | 60 | 60 | 60 | | |
| Golf | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | |
| Gymnastics | 12 | | 12 | | 12 | 13 | | 13 | | 13 | |
| Ice Hockey | 20 | | 20 | | 20 | 25 | | 25 | | — | |
| Lacrosse | 24 | | 24 | | 24 | 30 | 24 | 30 | 24 | 30 | 24 |
| Skiing | 12 | | 8 | 12 | 12 | 12 | | 12 | | 12 | |
| Soccer | 18 | 23 | 18 | 23 | 18 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | |
| Swimming | 18 | 24 | 18 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 24 |
| Tennis | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 9 | | 9 | | 9 | |
| Indoor Track | 22 | * | 22 | * | 22 | * | 28 | * | 28 | * | 28 |
| Outdoor Track | 27 | * | 27 | * | 27 | * | 34 | * | 34 | * | 34 |
| Volleyball | 10 | | 10 | | 10 | 13 | | 13 | | 13 | |
| Water Polo | 12 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | |
| Wrestling | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 15 |

*Travel and home squad size for indoor and outdoor track shall be 2 times the number of events (2 x No. Events).

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference, University of Connecticut, LeMoyne College.

Intent: To revise the limitations on travel and home squad sizes in all divisions as indicated.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 155 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

| | Div. I | | Travel Squad Div. II | | Div. III | |
|---------------|--------|----|-------------------------|----|----------|----|
| Baseball | 18 | 21 | 18 | 21 | 18 | 21 |
| Basketball | 10 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 12 | |
| Cross Country | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 |
| Fencing | 12 | | 12 | | 12 | |
| Football | 48 | 52 | 48 | 52 | 48 | 52 |
| Golf | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | |
| Gymnastics | 12 | | 12 | | 12 | |
| Ice Hockey | 20 | | 20 | | 20 | |
| Lacrosse | 24 | | 24 | | 24 | |
| Skiing | 12 | | 8 | 12 | 12 | |
| Soccer | 18 | 23 | 18 | 23 | 18 | 23 |
| Swimming | 18 | 24 | 18 | 24 | 24 | |
| Tennis | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| Indoor Track | 22 | 28 | 22 | 28 | 22 | 28 |
| Outdoor Track | 27 | 36 | 27 | 36 | 27 | 36 |
| Volleyball | 10 | | 10 | | 10 | |
| Water Polo | 12 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 14 |
| Wrestling | 12 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 15 |

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference, University of Connecticut, LeMoyne College.

Intent: To revise the limitations on travel squad size in all divisions as indicated.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 156 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—BASEBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 92, as follows:

“(a) In the sport of baseball, the travel squad limitation specified may be exceeded if the trip lasts more than four days and if more than five games are played on that trip, but in no such circumstance shall the squad include more than 21 participants (players).”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit up to 21 players on the baseball travel squad for extended trips as specified.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 157 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—BASEBALL

Amend Proposal No. 156; Bylaw 12-2-(a), as follows:

“(a) In the sport of baseball, the travel squad limitation specified may be exceeded if the trip lasts more than four days and if more than five games are played on that trip, but in no such circumstance shall the squad include more than 21 participants (players).”

Source: University of Michigan, New Jersey State College Athletic Conference.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 158 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 92, as follows:

“(a) In the sport of basketball, the travel squad limitation specified may be exceeded by not more than two participants (players) if two or more games are played during the trip.”

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To permit not more than two additional players on the basketball travel squad for trips involving two games or more.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 159 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

“Squad Size Limitations Table. Division I. Basketball Travel Squad 10 12. Basketball Home Squad 13 15.”

Source: University of South Carolina.

Intent: To increase the size of the basketball travel and home squads in Division I from 10 to 12 and from 13 to 15, respectively.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 160 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division I. Travel Squad. Basketball 10 12."

Source: Big Eight Conference, Big Ten Conference, Western Athletic Conference, University of Notre Dame, Pennsylvania State University, Southeastern Conference, Southwest Athletic Conference, University of Michigan, U.S. Naval Academy, U.S. Military Academy, U.S. Air Force Academy.

Intent: To increase the size of the basketball travel squad in Division I from 10 to 12.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 161 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division III. Travel Squad. Basketball 12 13."

Source: Southeastern Massachusetts University.

Intent: To increase the size of the basketball travel squad in Division III from 12 to 13.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 162 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—CROSS COUNTRY

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division III. Travel Squad. Cross Country 9 11."

Source: Southeastern Massachusetts University.

Intent: To increase the size of the cross country travel squad in Division III from nine to 11.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 163 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, by adding new paragraph (a), as follows:

"(a) In the sport of football, the limitations provided for in this Section shall not apply to one game between traditional rivals. To qualify for this exception, such one game must be mutually identified by the competing institutions prior to the beginning of the academic year in which the competition is to be held, and the two institutions must have demonstrated a history of competition with each other."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To exempt one "traditional" football game from squad limitation regulations.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 164 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division I. Football Travel Squad 48 54. Football Home Squad 60 75."

Source: University of Michigan.

Intent: To increase the size of the football travel and home squads in Division I from 48 to 54 and from 60 to 75, respectively.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 165 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division I. Travel Squad. Football 48 54."

Source: Big Eight Conference, Big Ten Conference, University of Notre Dame, Pennsylvania State University, Atlantic Coast Conference, U.S. Naval Academy, U.S. Military Academy, U.S. Air Force Academy.

Intent: To increase the size of the football travel squad in division I from 48 to 54.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 166 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 92, as follows:

"(a) In the sport of football, if the visiting team is transported by bus to and from the site of the game, the competing institutions may determine the size of the home squad and travel squad permitted to dress for that game. However, the director of athletics of each institution shall provide a maxi-

num listing of fifty-four players who will be permitted to participate in the game."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To permit the competing institutions to agree upon the size of travel and home squads in cases where the visiting team travels to the site by bus, but to specify that neither squad shall exceed 54 players.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 167 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—LACROSSE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division III. Travel Squad. Lacrosse 2/ 30."

Source: Hobart College.

Intent: To increase the size of the lacrosse travel squad in Division III from 24 to 30.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 168 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—SWIMMING

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division I. Travel Squad. Swimming 18 20."

Source: Indiana University.

Intent: To increase the size of the swimming travel squad in Division I from 18 to 20.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 169 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—SWIMMING

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division III. Travel Squad. Swimming 24 18."

Source: New Jersey State College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To reduce the size of the swimming travel squad in Division III from 24 to 18.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 170 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—TRACK

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 92, as follows:

"(a) In the sports of indoor and outdoor track, the permissible travel and home squad size shall be the number of participants equalling two times the number of events in the particular meet." [NOTE: Indoor and outdoor track numbers would be eliminated from the Squad Size Limitations table.]

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference, Ivy Group.

Intent: To modify the travel and home squad size limitations in the sports of indoor and outdoor track as indicated.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 171 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—TRACK

Amend Proposal No. 170; Bylaw 12-2, as follows:

"(a) In the sports of indoor and outdoor track, the permissible travel and home squad size shall be the number of participants equalling two times the number of events in the particular meet, but in no case more than thirty contestants indoors or thirty-four contestants outdoors. In a situation where a team is hosting a non-scoring meet, there will be no limitation on the number of contestants the home team may enter."

Source: Indiana University.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 172 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—OUTDOOR TRACK

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division II. Home Squad. Outdoor Track 34 38."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To increase the size of the outdoor track home squad in Division II from 34 to 38.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 173 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—OUTDOOR TRACK

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II.]

"(a) Travel and home squad limitations in the sport of outdoor track may be increased by two participants per event for the hammer throw and/or six-mile run where either or both are included as regularly scheduled events in which the squad will compete in the particular meet."

Source: California State University, Chico; California State University, Hayward; California State University, Sacramento; University of California, Davis.

Intent: To permit a reasonable increase in squad size for Division II outdoor track where the specific additional events are scheduled.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 174 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—OUTDOOR TRACK

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division III. Outdoor Track Travel Squad 27 40. Outdoor Track Home Squad 34 40."

Source: Southeastern Massachusetts University.

Intent: To increase the size of the outdoor track travel and home squads in Division III from 27 to 40 and from 34 to 40, respectively.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 175 SQUAD LIMITATIONS—OUTDOOR TRACK

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2, page 92, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Division III. Travel Squad. Outdoor Track 27 30."

Source: New Jersey State College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To increase the size of the outdoor track travel squad in Division III from 27 to 30.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 141.

NO. 176 RECRUITING BENEFITS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 102, following Bylaw 1-1-(a), page 32, as follows:

"O.I. 102. The gift of any article of clothing or equipment (including training shirts bearing the institution's identification) to a prospective student-athlete shall be improper inducement. An institution's staff member or any other representative of an institution's athletic interests shall not, during recruitment of an individual and prior to the individual's enrollment at the institution, be involved, directly or indirectly, in making arrangements for or giving or offering to give any financial aid or other benefits to the prospective student-athlete, his relatives or friends, other than expressly permitted by governing legislation of this Association. This prohibition shall apply regardless of whether similar financial aid, benefits or arrangements are available to prospective students in general, their relatives or

friends. Specifically prohibited financial aid, benefits and arrangements include, but are not limited to: arrangement of employment of the relatives of a prospective student-athlete; gift of clothing or equipment; the cosigning of loans; provision of loans to the relatives or friends of a prospective student-athlete; cash or like items; any tangible items including merchandise, free or reduced-cost services or rental or purchases of any type, and free or reduced-cost housing. The arrangement of employment and the acceptance of loans from a regular lending agency (based upon a regular repayment schedule) shall be permitted."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To prohibit during recruiting the offering or providing of financial aid or other benefits not permitted by governing legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 177 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c) by deleting subparagraph (1), page 32, renumbering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(1) No more than three such contacts per student-athlete shall be permitted by any single institution."

Source: University of South Carolina.

Intent: To abolish the three-contact limitation.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 178 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Add new O.I. 106, following Bylaw 1-1-(c), page 32, renumbering subsequent O.I.'s, as follows:

"O.I. 106. Contact for the purpose of signing a conference or national letter of intent or similar appropriate institutional commitments shall be exempt as one of the off-campus contacts for recruiting purposes."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To specify that contacts for the purpose of signing letters of intent or appropriate institutional commitments shall not be counted as off-campus contacts for recruiting purposes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II with editorial changes as reflected in No. 178-1 (Appendix E).

NO. 179 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c)-(1), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(1) No more than *three five* such contacts per student-athlete shall be permitted by any single institution."

Source: Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To increase the number of permissible off-campus recruiting contacts by two.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 180 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c)-(1) and (2), page 32, re-numbering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(1) No such contact shall be made by the head football coach or by the head basketball coach.

"(1) (2) No more than three such contacts by any other person per student-athlete shall be permitted by any single institution."

Source: University of Michigan.

Intent: To restrict head football coaches and head basketball coaches to recruiting on the campus only.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 181 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(c) Divisions I and II—Contact in person with a prospective student-athlete or his relatives or legal guardian off campus for purposes of recruitment (per O.I. 100) by institutional staff members and/or representatives of athletic interests is subject to the following limitations:

"(1) No more than three such contacts per student-athlete, which shall include contacts with his relatives or legal guardian, shall be permitted by any single institution."

[Remaining paragraphs remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To include relatives and legal guardians of prospective student-athletes in restricting off-campus recruiting contacts.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 182 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(c) Divisions I and II—Contact in person with a prospective student-athlete or his parents off campus for purposes of recruitment (per O.I. 100) by institutional staff members and/or representatives of athletic interests is subject to the following limitations:"

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To include contact with a prospect's parents within the controls of this legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 181.

NO. 183 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c)-(5), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(5) Such All contact with a high school sports award winner and high school, college preparatory school and junior college coach in that sport is prohibited during the following periods: [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To prohibit contacts with high school athletes and coaches during the specified periods.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II (Division II vote, 46-48). Division I first approved No. 183, 103-95, but later voted to reconsider and defeated it.

NO. 184 RECRUITING CONTACTS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b), page 32, as follows:

"(b) Division III—No athletic staff member or other representative of the institution's athletic interests shall contact a prospective student-athlete, his parents or his legal guardian(s) in person off campus for recruiting purposes (per O.I. 100) during the academic year until the prospect completes his junior year in high school."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I and II.]

"(c) Divisions I and II—Contact in person with a prospective student-athlete, his parents or his legal guardian(s) off-campus for purposes of recruitment (per O.I. 100) by institutional staff members and/or representatives of athletic interests is subject to the following limitations:

"(1) No more than three such contacts per with a student-athlete, his parents or his legal guardians shall be permitted by any single institution."

[Delete subparagraphs (2), (3), (4) and (5).]

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference, University of Connecticut, LeMoyne College.

Intent: To include the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s) in the off-campus contact restrictions for all three divisions, to permit such contacts to take place at any time after the prospect completes his junior year in high school and to maintain the present limit of three such contacts per student-athlete by any institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 185 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(c) Divisions I and II—Contact in person with a prospective student-athlete off campus for purposes of recruitment (per O.I. 100) by institutional staff members and/or representatives of athletic interests is subject to the following limitations:

"(1) No more than three such contacts per with a prospective student-athlete, his relatives or guardian(s) shall be permitted by any single institution.

"(2) No such contact shall be made until the beginning of the permissible period for such contact as noted in paragraph (3) below in the prospective student-athlete's senior year in high school with a prospective student-athlete, or his relatives or guardian(s), until the prospective student-athlete has completed his junior year in high school.

"(3) The final date for contact in all sports shall be June 15 in the prospective student-athlete's senior year in high school.

"(3) In-season contact shall be limited to a period from 6:00 a.m. Friday until 6:00 p.m. the following Sunday within the following dates: Fall Sports—August 15 through December 1. Winter Sports—October 15 through March 15. Spring Sports—January 1 through May 15.

"(4) Out-of-season contact is permissible but shall be limited to the following dates: Fall Sports—December 1 through April 1. Winter Sports—March 15 through June 15. Spring Sports—May 15 through June 15.

"(5) Such contact is prohibited during the following periods: Fall Sports—April 2 through August 14. Winter Sports—June 16 through October 14. Spring Sports—June 16 through December 31."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To include relatives and legal guardians of prospective student-athletes in the restrictions on recruiting contacts; to eliminate the "seasonal" restrictions on recruiting, and to permit such contacts during the summer immediately preceding the prospect's senior year in high school.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II, making Nos. 186-189 out of order.

NO. 186 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(c) Divisions I and II—Contact in person with a prospective student-athlete off campus for purposes of recruitment (per O.I. 100) by institutional staff members and/or representatives of athletic interests is subject to the following limitations: limited to no more than three such contacts per student-athlete by any single institution. No such contact may be made until the prospective student-athlete begins classes his senior year in secondary school.

"(1) No more than three such contacts per student-athlete shall be permitted by any single institution.

"(2) No such contact shall be made until the beginning of the permissible period for such contact as noted in paragraph (3) below in the prospective student-athlete's senior year in high school.

"(3) In-season contact shall be limited to a period from 6:00 a.m. Friday until 6:00 p.m. the following Sunday within the following dates: Fall Sports—August 15 through December 1. Winter Sports—October 15 through March 15. Spring Sports—January 1 through May 15.

"(4) Out-of-season contact is permissible but shall be limited to the following dates: Fall Sports—December 1 through April 1. Winter Sports—March 15 through June 15. Spring Sports—May 15 through June 15.

"(5) Such contact is prohibited during the following periods: Fall Sports—April 2 through August 14. Winter Sports—June 16 through October 14. Spring Sports—June 16 through December 31."

Source: Ivy Group.

Intent: To remove all calendar limitations on off-campus personal recruiting contact and to establish that such contact may not occur prior to the senior year in high school.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 185.

NO. 187 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c)-(3), (4) and (5), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(3) In-season contact shall be limited to a period from 6:00 a.m. Friday until 6:00 p.m. the following Sunday within the following dates: Fall Sports Football—August 15 through December 1. Winter Sports Basketball—October 15 through March 15. Spring Sports—January 1 through May 15.

"(4) Out-of-season contact is permissible but shall be limited to the following dates: Fall Sports Football—December 1 through April 1. Winter Sports Basketball—March 15 through

June 15. *Spring Sports—May 15 through June 15.*

"(5) Such contact is prohibited during the following periods:
Fall Sports Football—April 2 through August 14. Winter Sports Basketball—June 16 through October 14. Spring Sports—June 16 through December 31."

Source: Iowa State University.

Intent: To remove the calendar recruiting periods for all sports other than football and basketball.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 185.

NO. 188 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c)-(4) and (5), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(4) Out-of-season contact is permissible but shall be limited to the following dates: *Fall Sports—December 1 through April 1. Winter Sports—March 15 through June 15. Spring Sports—May 15 through June August 15.*

"(5) Such contact is prohibited during the following periods:
Fall Sports—April 2 through August 14. Winter Sports—June 16 through October 14. Spring Sports—June August 16 through December 31."

Source: Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To provide an additional two months for permissible out-of-season contacts in spring sports.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 185.

NO. 189 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c)-(4) and (5), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(4) Out-of-season contact is permissible but shall be limited to the following dates: *Fall Sports—December 1 2 through April 1. Winter Sports—March 15 16 through June 15. Spring Sports—May 15 16 through June July 15.*

"(5) Such contact is prohibited during the following periods:
Fall Sports—April 2 through August 14. Winter Sports—June 16 through October 14. Spring Sports—June July 16 through December 31."

Source: Fresno State University.

Intent: To correct ambiguities in the starting dates for permissible out-of-season contacts and to provide an additional month for permissible out-of-season contacts in spring sports.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 185.

NO. 190 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c), by adding new subparagraph (6), page 32, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(6) In the sport of basketball only, the following limitations shall apply: Prospects may be recruited from June 15 to October 15 and from April 1 to May 15, with the understanding that there be no more than two in-person contacts (a total of four) within that period. From October 15 to April 1 there shall be no contact with a prospect, but from December 1 to April 1 prospects may be evaluated through in-person attendance at basketball games."

Source: Western Athletic Conference, Pennsylvania State University, University of Kansas, University of South Carolina.

Intent: To specify recruiting contact limitations in the sport of basketball only, exempting that sport from the provisions of Bylaw 1-1-(c)-(1), (2), (3), (4) and (5), as recommended by the National Association of Basketball Coaches.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 191 RECRUITING CONTACTS—SCOUTING

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (f), page 33, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(f) Institutional athletic staff members and/or other representatives of athletic interests are prohibited from in-person contact with high school, preparatory school and junior college staff personnel for purposes of scouting prospective student-athletes (including, but not limited to, the collecting of personal data and/or film and observing workouts or contests, etc.) during the following period: *Football—April 2 through August 14.*"

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To prohibit scouting of prospective student-athletes in the sport of football during the period specified.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 192 RECRUITING CONTACTS—SERVICE ACADEMIES

Bylaws: Add new O.I. 105, following Bylaw 1-1-(c), page 32, renumbering subsequent O.I.'s, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"O.I. 105. The NCAA Council has approved an exception to Bylaw 1-1-(c) in regard to the recruiting programs of the U.S. Air Force, Coast Guard, Military and Naval Academies where Congressionally required institutional procedures ap-

plying to all cadets and midshipmen, regardless of athletic ability, are in conflict with the Association's legislation governing off-campus recruiting contacts. This action provides that the three permissible off-campus recruiting contacts with a prospective student-athlete may be made by a member of the athletic staff or representative of the athletic interests of one of the academies at any time during the prospective student-athlete's junior year in high school, it being understood that any such contacts subsequent to a prospect's junior year are governed by the provisions of Bylaw 1-1-(c)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the national service academies to contact prospective student-athletes in accordance with their regular admission procedures as directed by the U.S. Congress.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 193 RECRUITING—PUBLICITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(f), page 33, as follows:

"(f) No member institution shall publicize or arrange publicity of the commitment of a prospective student-athlete to attend the institution or accept its tender of financial assistance other than through its written or telephonic communication with the institution's normal media outlets and the normal media outlets of the student-athlete's current and former educational institutions. Press conferences, receptions, dinners or similar meetings held for the purpose of making such announcements are expressly prohibited, as is personal contact with media representatives at the site of a signing; further Further, no member institution shall publicize or arrange publicity of the visit of a prospective student-athlete to the institution's campus."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit written or telephonic contact with media representatives in the student-athlete's high school (and/or junior college) community at the time he is signed.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 194 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits for which an institution may provides travel expenses for prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows:" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Ivy Group.

Intent: To establish that the limitations on the number of institutionally provided campus visits applies only to those visits for which travel expenses are paid.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 195 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes in the following sports during an academic year, as follows: Football—Seventy-five; Basketball—Twelve; Baseball—Seven; Cross Country/Track—Eight; Fencing—Three; Golf—Three; Gymnastics—Four; Ice Hockey—Nine; Lacrosse—Eight; Skiing—Four; Soccer—Seven; Swimming—Seven; Tennis—Three; Volleyball—Three; Water Polo—Three; Wrestling—Seven. In addition, there shall be an overall limit of fifty-three on the total number of visits each academic year for all sports excluding football and basketball. The institution must maintain a written record of the paid visits of prospective student-athletes pursuant to this paragraph."

Source: Iowa State University.

Intent: To eliminate the limitations on campus visitations in all sports other than football and basketball.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Division I approved elimination of campus visit limitations in all sports other than football and basketball and increased the permissible numbers to 95 in football and 18 in basketball. This was achieved by employing the "filling blanks" procedure as specified in Robert's Rules of Order. Proposal No. 197 was introduced, and all numbers were declared as "blanks." Considering football numbers in the order of decreasing modification, Division I defeated 100 as in No. 200, 61-76, and then approved 95 as in No. 196. All other proposed football numbers thus were ruled out of order. Then Division I approved 18 in basketball as in No. 201, 112-96, and all other basketball numbers were ruled out of order. Division I voted to eliminate the limitations in all other sports as proposed in No. 195, and then voted to approve the actions as sequentially outlined herein.

NO. 196 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Football—Seventy-five; Basketball—Twelve; Eight—

teen; Baseball—Seven Ten; Cross Country/Track—Eight Twelve; Fencing—Three Five; Golf—Three Five; Gymnastics—Four Six; Ice Hockey—Nine Fifteen; Lacrosse—Eight Twelve; Skiing—Four Six; Soccer—Seven Twelve; Swimming—Seven Ten; Tennis—Three Five; Volleyball—Three Five; Water Polo—Three Five; Wrestling—Seven Ten. In addition, there shall be an overall limit of fifty-three on the total number of visits each academic year for all sports excluding football and basketball. The institution must maintain a written record of the paid visits of prospective student-athletes pursuant to this paragraph."

Source: Ivy Group.

Intent: To increase the permissible number of paid visits in each sport and to eliminate the overall limit on the total number of visits.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 197 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Football—Seventy-five; Basketball—Twelve; Baseball—Seven; Cross Country/Track—Eight; Fencing—Three; Golf—Three; Gymnastics—Four; Ice Hockey—Nine; Lacrosse—Eight; Skiing—Four; Soccer—Seven; Swimming—Seven; Tennis—Three; Volleyball—Three; Water Polo—Three; Wrestling—Seven. In addition, there shall be an overall limit of fifty-three ninety on the total number of visits each academic year for all sports excluding football and basketball. The institution must maintain a written record of the paid visits of prospective student-athletes pursuant to this paragraph."

Source: Ivy Group.

Intent: To increase the overall limit on the total number of visits from 53 to 90.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 198 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Football—Seventy-five; Basketball—Twelve; Baseball—Seven; Cross Country/Track—Eight; Fencing—Three; Golf—Three;

Gymnastics—Four; Ice Hockey—Nine; Lacrosse—Eight; Skiing—Four; Soccer—Seven; Swimming—Seven; Tennis—Three; Volleyball—Three; Water Polo—Three; Wrestling—Seven. In addition, there shall be an overall limit of fifty-three seventy-five on the total number of visits each academic year for all sports excluding football and basketball. The institution must maintain a written record of the paid visits of prospective student-athletes pursuant to this paragraph."

Source: Ivy Group.

Intent: To increase the overall limit on the total number of visits from 53 to 75.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 199 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Football—Seventy-five;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: University of South Carolina.

Intent: To abolish the limitation on the number of paid visits in the sport of football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 200 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Football—Seventy-five One hundred;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Big Ten Conference, Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To increase the permissible number of paid visits in the sport of football from 75 to 100.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 201 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Basketball—*Twelve Eighteen*;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Pennsylvania State University, Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To increase the permissible number of paid visits in the sport of basketball from 12 to 18.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 202 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Basketball—*Twelve Thirty in any consecutive two-year period, with no more than eighteen in any one year*;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: University of Kansas.

Intent: To increase and provide flexibility in the limitation on paid visits in the sport of basketball, similar to the two-year provision in the limitation on basketball grants-in-aid.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 203 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Basketball—*Twelve Fifteen*;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To increase the permissible number of paid visits in the sport of basketball from 12 to 15.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 204 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Gymnastics—*Four Seven*;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: University of Michigan.

Intent: To increase the permissible number of paid visits in the sport of gymnastics from four to seven.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 205 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 36, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(1) Division I—In each sport, there shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes during an academic year, as follows: Ice Hockey—*Nine Eighteen*;" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: Boston University, University of New Hampshire, Harvard College, Dartmouth College, Colgate University, Brown University, Northeastern University.

Intent: To increase the permissible number of paid visits in the sport of ice hockey from nine to 18.

Action: See No. 195.

NO. 206 CAMPUS VISITATIONS LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a), by adding new subparagraph (3), page 36, as follows:

"(3) For a particular sport, an institution shall be allowed one additional paid visitation for each student-athlete who signs a professional contract after signing a national or conference letter of intent with that institution."

Source: Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To enable an institution to provide an additional paid visit in a given sport beyond the number permitted for that sport for each student-athlete signing a professional sports contract after he has signed a letter of intent with the institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 207 CAMPUS VISITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a) and (b), page 36, as follows:

"Section 5. Transportation, Visitations and Entertainment.
(a) A member institution may finance one and only one visit to its campus for a given prospective student-athlete. Such visit shall not exceed forty-eight hours. Only actual round

trip transportation costs by direct route between the student's home and the institution's campus may be paid. If commercial air transportation is used, the fare may not exceed tourist (or comparable) class.

"(b) Any person, at his own expense, may transport or pay the transportation costs of a prospective student-athlete to visit the campus of a member institution one time provided such person, at his own expense, accompanies the prospective student-athlete on his visit. Only actual round-trip transportation costs by direct route between the student-athlete's home and the institution's campus may be provided. If commercial air transportation is used, the fare may not exceed tourist (or comparable) class. Such visit shall not exceed forty-eight hours."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To specify that commercial air fare for the one permissible expense-paid campus visit by a prospective student-athlete may not exceed tourist or comparable class.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 208 CAMPUS VISITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(a), page 36, as follows:

"Section 5. Transportation, Visitations and Entertainment.

(a) A member institution may finance one and only one visit to its campus for a given prospective student-athlete. Such visit shall not exceed forty-eight hours. Only actual round-trip transportation costs by direct route between the student-athlete's home and the institution's campus may be paid. However, local transportation may be provided for the student-athlete host for use during the official visit, provided such transportation is limited to the institution's campus and contiguous environs."

Source: University of South Carolina.

Intent: To permit payment for local transportation, through the prospect's host student-athlete, during the one permissible expense-paid visit by a prospective student-athlete.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Ruled out of order.

NO. 209 CAMPUS VISITATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5, by deleting paragraph (d), page 36, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Divisions I and II.]

"(d) Divisions I and II—A prospect may accept not more than one expense-paid visit to not more than six member institutions. Each Division I and II member institution shall be required to notify in writing, at the time of its invitation, each

prospective student-athlete whom it invites to receive an expense-paid visit of the limitations imposed by this Bylaw; further, that invitation and notification shall occur at least five calendar days in advance of the visit."

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the limitation on the number of institutions a prospective student-athlete may visit on an expense-paid basis.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 210 CAMPUS VISITATION

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 122, following Bylaw 1-5-(j), page 38, as follows:

"O.I. 122. A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at his own expense as often as he wishes. During such visits, the institution may not pay any expense for two meals or provide any entertainment except and provide a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletic event for the exclusive use of admitting the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying him on the visit. Payment of any additional expenses or providing any other entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

Source: Pennsylvania State College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit an institution to provide two meals to a prospective student-athlete during a campus visit without counting it as a paid visit.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 211 CAMPUS VISITATION

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 122, following Bylaw 1-5-(j), page 38, as follows:

"O.I. 122. A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at his own expense as often as he wishes. During such visits, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a meal in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities and a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletic event for the exclusive use of admitting the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying him on the visit. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

Source: East Coast Conference.

Intent: To permit an institution to provide one meal to a prospective student-athlete in the institution's dining facilities during a campus visit without counting it as a paid visit.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 212 LETTER OF INTENT

Bylaws: Amend Article 1 by adding a new Section 9, page 40, as follows:

"Section 9. Letter of Intent. When a prospective student-athlete in high school, college preparatory school or junior college submits a letter of intent signed by the prospect and the prospect's parents (or guardian) in which the prospect designates the NCAA member institution in which he intends to enroll and the letter of intent is submitted to that institution's faculty athletic committee, the prospect's decision will be accepted as final by the member institutions of the NCAA.

"(a) The signing date of such applications for students planning to enroll in the beginning fall term cannot be prior to 8:00 a.m. of the third Wednesday in February for fall sports; 8:00 a.m. of the third Wednesday in April for winter sports, and 8:00 a.m. of the third Wednesday in May for spring sports.

"(b) A prospective student-athlete failing to meet the academic requirements of the institution, its conference (if any) or the NCAA shall be released from this letter.

"(c) A student who has signed more than one letter of intent or signed a letter of intent but enters another NCAA institution shall be ineligible for competition and financial aid (per O.I. 500) for two academic years subsequent to his entrance in the beginning fall term after the signing date.

"(d) The signing of the letter of intent must take place in the prospective student-athlete's home community. If the prospect is not traveling as a member of his school's athletic team, the prospect must not be absent from his home community for a period of twenty-four hours before the permissible signing date and must spend the night prior to the permissible signing date in his home."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To enable all NCAA member institutions to participate in a national letter of intent with common signing dates.

Effective Date: Immediately; applicable to all student-athletes first entering a member institution after the fall term, 1976-77 academic year.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 213 ELIGIBILITY

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9, by deleting paragraph (j), page 19, as follows:

"(j) He shall annually, prior to participation in intercollegiate competition during the academic year in question, sign a statement in a form prescribed by the NCAA Council in which he submits information related to his eligibility, recruitment, financial aid and amateur status under the governing legislation of this Association. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2, by deleting paragraph (d), page 20, as follows:

"(d) To administer annually on a form prescribed by the Council a signed statement for each student-athlete in accordance with Constitution 3-9-(j), as follows:

"(1) The statement shall be individually administered to each student-athlete by the director of athletics prior to the student's participation in intercollegiate competition each academic year.

"(2) The director of athletics and head coach in the sport in which the student-athlete participates shall sign each statement as required by the prescribed form.

"(3) The statement shall be kept on file in the office of the director of athletics, and such file shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of another member institution, the NCAA and, as to members of an allied conference, an authorized representative of the conference."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference, Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To remove the requirement of a "student-athlete statement."

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 214 ELIGIBILITY

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(j), page 19, as follows:

"(j) He shall annually, prior to participation in intercollegiate competition during the academic year in question, sign a statement in a form of not more than two pages prescribed by the NCAA Council in which he submits information related to his eligibility, recruitment, financial aid and amateur status under the governing legislation of this Association. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2-(d), page 20, as follows:

"(d) To administer annually on a form of not more than two pages prescribed by the Council a signed statement for each student-athlete in accordance with Constitution 3-9-(j), as follows:

"(1) The statement shall be individually administered individually or in groups by the director of athletics or his representative in these matters prior to the student's participation in intercollegiate competition each academic year."

[Subparagraphs (2) and (3) remain unchanged.]

Source: Southern Conference.

Intent: To restrict the form of the student-athlete statement to not more than two pages in length; to permit the form to be administered in groups, and to allow the director of athletics to designate a representative to administer the form.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

**NO. 215 OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP—
LEGAL COSTS**

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (f), page 20, as follows:

"(f) To exhaust all procedures for appeal and review of institutional and individual eligibility actions permitted by the governing legislation of the Association before it shall seek any judicial remedies; further, any member which brings legal action against the Association (or any of its members, Officers or agents), or directly or indirectly encourages or induces another to bring such a legal action, or fails to cooperate fully with the Association in the defense of such an action in which the Association is involved, wherein it is sought to stay the NCAA's enforcement procedures or eligibility rulings prior to fully exhausting NCAA procedures, may, when consistent with the results and upon termination of such legal action, and pursuant to the official procedure governing the NCAA enforcement program, in addition to all other disciplinary measures authorized under Section 7, be charged for all or part of the Association's actual expenses, including legal fees, incurred in defending such action, and may be subjected to disciplinary action and termination of membership for failing to fulfill conditions and obligations of membership under this Section."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a member to pursue internal appeal and review procedures of the Association before becoming involved, directly or indirectly, in legal actions designed to exempt the member institution from legislation adopted by the Association; if a member ignores this provision, and it fails to prevail in the legal action, it may be charged for all or part of the Association's legal expenses and subject to enforcement proceedings for violating the membership requirement.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated as amended (see No. 215-1, Appendix E).

NO. 216 CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(d), pages 60-61, as follows:

"(d) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless its chief executive officer certifies annually on a form and by a date (the original or a copy of the form to be received at the NCAA national office by that date) approved by the NCAA Council that:"

[Subparagraphs remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that the institutional certification of compliance form (or copy thereof) must be sent to the NCAA national office.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 217 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(d)-(2), page 61, as follows:

"(2) At the time of such certification (i) no current member of its coaching staff is, pursuant to the provisions of Section 7-(a)-(12) of the Official Procedure Governing the NCAA Enforcement Program and as a result of violation of the principles of ethical conduct enunciated in Constitution 3-6-(a), serving a period of debarment imposed by a member institution (which period of debarment may not exceed two years), and (ii) the coaching contract of any current member of its coaching staff has not, pursuant to the aforesaid provisions, within the immediately preceding two years been terminated by it or another member institution as a result of violation as aforesaid, provided that this subsection (2) shall not be operative with reference to any individual member of the member institution's coaching staff whose debarment or the termination of whose coaching contract shall have been imposed without a hearing by the member institution imposing same, and shall subsequently have been expressly approved by the NCAA Committee on Infractions or the NCAA Council after further hearing pursuant to the provisions of the aforesaid Section 7-(a)-(12), notice of and opportunity to be heard at such NCAA hearing having been given to the individual in question as well as to the member institution imposing the penalty; has been temporarily or permanently suspended from his coaching duties by another member institution during the past two years as a result of his involvement in a violation of the principles of ethical conduct set forth in Constitution 3-6-(a), as determined by the NCAA Committee on Infractions or the NCAA Council; provided the period of suspension is in effect, and provided the coaching staff member has been given through the institution notice of and opportunity to be heard at both the NCAA hearing, resulting in the finding of his involvement in the violation, and the institutional hearing resulting in his suspension."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify existing legislation concerning institutional certification for NCAA events when a coaching staff member has been suspended from coaching duties for a violation of the "Principles of Ethical Conduct."

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 218 ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 3, page 112, as follows.

"Section 3. If the Committee on Infractions, after consideration of the information which has been developed and after consultation with the investigative staff, determines that there has been a violation not of a serious nature, it may privately reprimand and censure without a hearing; if it determines that an allegation or complaint warrants an official inquiry, it shall determine its scope and thrust and direct a letter to the chief

executive officer of the member involved (with copies to the faculty representative and athletic director of the member, and to the executive officer of the allied conference of which the institution is a member) and to the Association vice-president of the district in which the member is located) fully informing him of the matter under inquiry and requesting his cooperation to the end that the facts may be discovered." [Remainder of Section remains unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To eliminate Association vice-presidents from those included in the notification procedure regarding infractions inquiries, inasmuch as the Council is no longer the hearing body in infractions matters.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 219 DUE PROCESS

Recommended Policies: Add a new Recommended Policy 13, page 110, as follows:

"In the administration of their athletic programs in accordance with NCAA regulations and their conditions and obligations of membership in the Association, member institutions may find it necessary, from time to time, to terminate or suspend the eligibility of student-athletes for participation in intercollegiate competition and organized athletic practice sessions. In any such case the member institution should notify the student-athlete concerned and afford him an opportunity for an informal hearing before the faculty athletic representative, director of athletics or other appropriate institutional authority before action is taken, it being understood that the hearing opportunity shall not delay or set aside the member's obligations required by Constitution 4-2-(a)-O.I. 18 and Section 9 of the Enforcement Procedure. This hearing opportunity will avoid possible mistaken actions affecting the student-athlete's eligibility and should satisfy due process procedures if any be required."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To encourage a member institution to provide an informal hearing to a student-athlete involved in the application of NCAA eligibility regulations by the institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 220 DETERMINATION OF DIVISIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(c)-(3), page 89, as follows:

"(3) A member, in petitioning under the terms of (1) or (2), shall submit its request to the Association's executive director in writing not later than June 1. If the Council determines that the member has met all applicable criteria of the division, as set forth in Bylaw 11, and has operated in confor-

mity for a period of two years from June 1 with all other Bylaw requirements of the division as they pertain to the sport in question, the member shall be eligible for said sport in the division effective the September 1 following submission of the petition. The institution must continue to be classified in that division for that sport for a minimum of three years."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a member institution desiring to participate in a sport in another division to operate for a two-year period in conformity with all Bylaw requirements applicable to the division in that sport before being eligible for such participation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 221 CHANGE OF DIVISIONAL MEMBERSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 2, page 89, as follows:

"Section 2. Change of Divisional Membership. A member may request a change of its divisional membership by petitioning the Council. An institution desiring to change its divisional membership must notify the Association's executive director in writing not later than June 1. If the Council determines that a member has met all applicable criteria (if any), as set forth in Bylaw 11, of the division to which it intends to transfer, and has operated in conformity for a period of two years from June 1 with all other Bylaw requirements of the division, the member shall be transferred to the new division effective the September 1 following submission of the petition. The institution must continue to be classified in that division for a minimum of three years."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a member institution desiring to change divisional membership to operate for a two-year period in conformity with all Bylaw requirements applicable to that division.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 222 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 4-(b) and (c), page 90, as follows:

"(b) A member institution in Division II or Division III desiring to enter a team or a student-athlete in a National Collegiate championship in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 6-4-(b) shall meet all institutional and individual eligibility requirements of its division. After September 1, 1976, such institutions shall meet the institutional and individual eligibility requirements of Division I for the sport in question, including academic standards for initial participation."

"(c) A member institution in Division III shall be eligible to compete in the Division II championships in those sports

for which no meet or tournament is conducted for Division III according to the applicable institutional and individual eligibility rules of Division III for the sport in question. *After September 1, 1976, Division III institutions shall meet all institutional and individual eligibility requirements of Division II for the sport in question, including standards for initial participation.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To permit Division II and III institutions to participate under the eligibility rules of their own divisions in NCAA championships in those sports for which only one championship is sponsored by the Association and to permit Division III institutions to participate under the eligibility rules of their own division in NCAA Division II championships in those sports for which no Division III championship is sponsored by the Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 223 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS— CLASSIFICATION COMMITTEE

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (d), page 76, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(d) The Classification Committee shall be responsible for the classification and reclassification of the divisional membership of each member institution. It shall review each application for membership in the Association to determine whether the applicant meets the applicable provisions set forth in Bylaws 10 and 11. It also shall conduct an annual review to determine whether each member institution is continuing to meet the criteria of its division. The Committee shall consist of three members from each division and a chairman to be selected at large."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Sections 1 and 2, pages 89-90, as follows:

"Section 1. Determination of Divisions. Each member institution shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division II or Division III for certain legislative and competitive purposes.

[Paragraph (a) remains unchanged.]

"(b) At the time of application, a prospective member shall designate the membership division of which it chooses to be a member and its preferred football classification it desires. The membership application shall be considered by the Classification Committee, which shall determine the division for which the prospective member qualifies under the applicable criteria. If it satisfies the applicable criteria, the institution's membership The application then shall be submitted for possible election to membership in accordance with the provisions of Constitution 4 and Bylaw 7-2.

[Paragraph (c) and subparagraphs (1) and (2) remain unchanged.]

"(3) A member, in petitioning under the terms of (1) and (2), shall submit its request to the Association's executive director in writing not later than June 1. If the Council Classification Committee determines that the member has met all applicable criteria of the division as they pertain to the sport in question, the member shall be the Classification Committee shall declare the applicant eligible for said sport in the division effective the September 1 following submission of the petition. The institution must continue to be classified in that division for that sport for a minimum of three years.

"(d) By amendment to Bylaw 11, the members of each division may establish criteria for membership and competition by sport in that division. Each institution, either as a member of that division or as an institution which competes in a sport in that division, at the time the criteria are adopted shall have five years from the date of adoption to conform to the requirements. If after five years an institution has not conformed to the adopted criteria of its division, the Council Classification Committee shall reassign the institution's membership or its sport to a division for which it qualifies, or if either the member or its sport does not qualify for any division, the institution shall be reclassified as an associate member.

"Section 2. Change of Divisional Membership. A member may request a change of its divisional membership by petitioning the Council Classification Committee. An institution desiring to change its divisional membership must notify the Association's executive director in writing not later than June 1. If the Council Classification Committee determines that a member has met all applicable criteria (if any) of the division to which it intends to transfer, the member shall be transferred to the new division, effective the September 1 following submission of the petition. The institution must continue to be classified in that division for a minimum of three years."

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To establish the Classification Committee as a standing committee to be responsible for the classification and reclassification of divisional members and to assign to that Committee specific responsibilities regarding divisional membership currently assigned to the Council; the actions of the Committee shall be subject to approval of the Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 224 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS— CLASSIFICATION COMMITTEE

Amend Proposal No. 223; Bylaws 8-2-(d) and 10-1 and 2, as follows:

"(d) The divisional Classification Committees shall be responsible for the classification and reclassification of the divisional membership of each member institution. It Each divisional committee shall review each application for membership in the Association its division to determine whether the

applicant meets the applicable provisions set forth in Bylaws 10 and 11. *It Each divisional committee shall also conduct an annual review to determine whether each member institution is continuing to meet the criteria of its division. The Each divisional committee shall consist of three members from each that division, and a chairman to be selected at large.*

[NOTE: Proposal No. 232-B would be revised to substitute "appropriate divisional classification committee" for "Classification Committee" in each instance.]

Source: University of Notre Dame, Pennsylvania State University, Big Eight Conference, Western Athletic Conference, Southeastern Conference, Atlantic Coast Conference.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 225 RESOLUTION: REORGANIZATION

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the NCAA Classification Committee is hereby directed to immediately review the divisional membership classification of each member institution and to place all member institutions in the appropriate divisional classifications;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that no institution shall be reclassified to a division of a lower number in the sport of football without the express consent of that institution;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee, in its initial reclassification, may place an institution in a given division even though it may not meet all of the criteria for that division if the Committee determines that the institution will be able to meet the criteria within five years in the sport of football and/or within three years in the sport of basketball;

"BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Committee shall complete its initial reclassification not later than April 1, 1976; that all appeals for reconsideration by member institutions shall be concluded not later than May 1, 1976, and that all classifications shall be effective August 1, 1976."

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 226 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS—GUIDELINES

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 90, as follows:

"(a) In evaluating a petition for a change of division in the sport of football, the Classification Committee shall consider the following factors:

"(1) A statement of commitment to the division sought from the chief executive officer of the institution.

"(2) The institution's future scheduling patterns in the sport of football, including at least four seasons subsequent to the effective date desired.

"(3) The financial aid program for students participating in the sport of football.

"(4) The number of sports sponsored by the institution on an intercollegiate basis, and the financial aid provided participants in sports other than football.

"(5) The available athletic facilities.

"(6) Past performance by the institution against opponents in the division in which membership is being sought."

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To establish guidelines for the Classification Committee's use in considering requests for change of division in the sport of football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 227 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS— PROBATIONARY STATUS

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (b), page 90, as follows:

"(b) An institution which petitions for membership in another division for which it does not meet the criteria at the time of application may be granted probationary status in the new division.

"(1) Such an institution must meet the criteria for membership in the new division within five years in the sport of football and three years in the sport of basketball.

"(2) During the period of its probation, the institution shall (i) apply all of the eligibility rules of the division to which it has applied for membership, and (ii) shall be eligible for championship competition in all sports in the new division, provided it is transferring to a division of a lower number. It shall not be eligible if transferring to a division of a higher number.

"(3) An opponent may regard the institution on probationary status as a member of its new division for the purpose of meeting scheduling requirements of divisional membership criteria.

"(4) An institution granted probationary status may not count games against another probationary institution toward any scheduling requirement for the division for which it has petitioned.

"(5) In order for a conference to transfer to a new division, its members individually must meet the scheduling requirements of the new division, and games against members of its conference shall not be counted."

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To establish a probationary status for institutions which petition for membership in another division but do not meet the criteria for that division at the time of application.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 228 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS— PROBATIONARY STATUS

Amend Proposal No. 227; Bylaw 10-2-(b), by adding new subparagraph (2), relettering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

"(2) During the period of its probation, a member shall not have the right to vote within that division until it is in compliance with all membership requirements of the division."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 229 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS—CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(d), page 89, as follows:

"(d) By amendment to Bylaw 11, the members of each division may establish criteria for membership and competition by sport in that division.

"(1) Institutions desiring membership in Division I shall be required to conform to the criteria established for membership in Division I immediately at the time the criteria are established. An institution failing to meet such criteria shall be reclassified to a division for which it qualifies.

"(2) In Division II or Division III, each institution, either as a member of that division or as an institution which competes in a sport in that division, at the time the criteria are adopted shall have five years from the date of adoption to conform to the requirements. If after five years an institution has not conformed to the adopted criteria of its division, the Council shall reassign the institution's membership or its sport shall be reassigned to a division for which it qualifies or, if either the member or its sport does not qualify for any division, the institution shall be reclassified as an associate member."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Eight Conference, Southeastern Conference, Western Athletic Conference, University of Notre Dame, Pennsylvania State University.

Intent: To specify that the five-year "grace period" for compliance with Bylaw 11 membership criteria shall not apply in Division I and that institutions desiring membership in Division I must be in conformance with such criteria at the time of adoption.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 230 DIVISION I CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(a), page 91, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"(a) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I in the sport of football, or to petition for a change of membership to Division I in that sport, must schedule more than fifty per cent of its games against members of Division I in that sport; further, a conference member must play at least sixty per cent of its nonconference games in football against members of Division I in that sport to qualify to petition for a change of membership to Division I."

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To specify that an institution must meet the Division I football scheduling requirement to petition for membership in that division in football and to establish a scheduling requirement for conference members seeking Division I football membership.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Division I football as amended (see No. 230-1, Appendix E), 48-75.

NO. 231 DIVISION I CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(b), page 91, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I, or to petition for a change of membership to Division I, shall schedule at least seventy-five per cent of its basketball games against members of Division I; further, a conference member must play at least ten nonconference games in basketball and at least seventy-five per cent of its nonconference games must be against members of Division I to qualify to petition for a change of membership to Division I."

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To specify that an institution must meet the Division I basketball scheduling requirement to petition for membership in that division and to establish a scheduling requirement for conference members seeking Division I membership.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Division I as amended (see No. 231-1, Appendix E).

NO. 232 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (c), page 90, as follows:

"(c) Each member institution must continue to meet the criteria of its division to remain a member of that division when any grace period following reclassification expires."

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To specify that each institution must continue to comply with the appropriate divisional membership criteria in order to maintain membership in that division.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 233 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS—DIVISION I-A

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1, page 89, as follows:

"Section 1. Determination of Divisions. Each member institution shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division I-A, Division II or Division III for certain legislative and competitive purposes."

Source: Yale University.

Intent: To create a Division I-A as a separate division for all legislative and competitive purposes.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 234 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS—DIVISION I-A

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1, page 89, as follows:

"Section 1. Determination of Divisions. Each member institution shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division II or Division III for certain legislative and competitive purposes. **In the sport of football only, Division I shall be divided into Division I and Division I-A, and these divisions shall vote separately on legislative issues which pertain directly to the sport of football.**

"(a) An institution applying for membership in the Association may designate any division for which it meets the applicable criteria contained in Bylaw 11. A member institution, however, shall not be eligible for membership in Division II or Division III if it is a member of Division I or Division I-A in football. An institution shall not be eligible for Division III if it is a member of Division II in football.

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To create a Division I-A in the sport of football only and to specify that members of Division I-A must be members of Division I for legislative and competitive purposes except that those members shall vote separately on legislative issues directly pertaining to football only.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 235 RESOLUTION: REORGANIZATION

"WHEREAS, there is a high degree of diversity in American educational institutions, so, too, is there a broad spectrum of diversity in intercollegiate football programs; and

"WHEREAS, there are varying philosophies, objectives, resources and levels of competition which characterize intercollegiate football in this country, it has become apparent that no one set of rules can satisfy such diverse programs; and

"WHEREAS, it is apparent for proper national administration of intercollegiate football that those institutions which share a common philosophy, purpose and interest should have the opportunity to develop appropriate legislation in order to accomplish their objectives;

"Now, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that this Convention shall accept the report of the Council-appointed Reclassification Committee and that reorganization of the Association shall be established in accordance with the divisional membership developed by the Reclassification Committee;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such reorganization shall be imple-

mented immediately so that the newly established divisions may exercise the opportunity to vote by division at this Convention on legislative matters which vitally affect the future of their programs."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Eight Conference, Southeastern Conference, Western Athletic Conference, University of Notre Dame, Pennsylvania State University.

[NOTE: The parliamentarian has announced that the resolution above will be ruled out of order inasmuch as it is not consistent with existing legislation as specified in Constitution 6-4. The Big Eight Conference requested that the proposal be circularized and that Conference will challenge the parliamentarian's ruling on the floor of the Convention.]

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 236 DIVISION I-A CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11 by adding new Section 2, page 91, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"Section 2. Criteria for Division I-A Membership. An institution which was a member of Division I-A as of August 1, 1976, shall conform to the following criteria for membership in Division I-A no later than August 1, 1981. An institution which applies for Division I-A membership subsequent to August 1, 1976, must meet the following criteria prior to making application.

"(a) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I-A, or to qualify to petition for a change of membership to Division I-A, must schedule more than 50 per cent of its football games against members of Division I or Division I-A in that sport; further, a conference member must play more than 50 per cent of its nonconference games in football against members of Division I or Division I-A in that sport to qualify to petition for a change of membership to Division I-A."

Source: NCAA Council (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To establish membership criteria for a new Division I-A.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 237 DIVISION I-A CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11 by adding new Section 2, page 91, renumbering subsequent Sections, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"Section 2. Criteria for Division I-A Membership. An institution desiring Division I-A membership must meet the following criteria:

"(a) The institution shall conform to the criteria for Division I membership as specified in Bylaw 11-1.

"(b) The institution must certify that its financial aid program for all undergraduate students is based on need as determined by the College Scholarship Service, Princeton, New Jersey, or similar service."

Source: Yale University.

Intent: To establish membership criteria for a new Division I-A in recognition of the differences in financial aid policies among member institutions.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 238 DIVISION III CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (c), page 92, as follows:

"(c) Institutions which have elected Division III through the process of self-determination shall conform to the following criterion for membership in Division III no later than January 1, 1981. Other institutions must conform to the following criterion prior to making application for Division III membership.

"(1) An institution in Division III shall have an undergraduate male enrollment not in excess of 2,000.

"(2) Institutions desiring membership in Division III which are unable to comply with this criterion may be admitted to Division III by requesting a mail vote of the entire membership of Division III. A two-thirds majority of Division III members voting in any such mail vote shall be required for approval of such membership."

Source: Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To establish an enrollment criterion for membership in Division III, in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 10-1-(d).

Effective Date: Immediately, with five-year compliance period in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 10-1-(d).

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 239 DIVISION III CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2-(a), page 91, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"Section 2. Criteria for Division III Membership. (a) An institution which was a member of Division III as of January 9, 1974, shall conform to the following criteria for membership in Division III no later than January August 1, 1979. An institution which applies for Division III membership subsequent to January 9, 1974, must declare its intention to conform to the following criteria by January August 1, 1979, at the time of application."

Source: DePauw University.

Intent: To delay the effective date of the Division III need criteria until the end of the 1978-79 academic year rather than implementing those criteria in the middle of that year.

Effective Date: As noted.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 240 DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

[NOTE: The following proposals are applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1, page 67, as follows:

"The National Collegiate Football Championship (Effective 1/1/77)."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2, page 41, as follows:

"Section 2. Postseason Football Contests. No member institution shall compete in any football game that is not scheduled as to the identity of a participating collegiate team before the beginning of the regular football season of the college for any academic year, unless the given contest is a part of the NCAA championships for Division II or Division III members in any division or complies with the following requirements or meets the following conditions:"

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(c), page 46, as follows:

"(c) The total playing schedule for any intercollegiate football team shall be limited in any one year to a maximum of eleven contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition to be played during the traditional fall season, exclusive of one scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided that the game be with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students, or both, and exclusive of (i) one postseason game approved by the Association's Extra Events Committee or (ii) those games played in the National Collegiate Division II and Division III Football Championships in any division."

[NOTE: The necessary Executive Regulations to implement the National Collegiate Football Championship will be circularized prior to or during the business session at the 70th Convention.]

Source: NCAA Council (National Collegiate Football Championship Feasibility Committee).

Intent: To establish a National Collegiate (Division I) Football Championship.

Effective Date: Immediately; first such championship to be conducted in January 1977.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 241 TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 4-(b), page 71, as follows:

"Section 4. Transfer of Membership. The following transfer of active members from their regular geographic districts is hereby made in accordance with Constitution 5-4:

"(b) From District 3 to District 2

"Baltimore, University of, Baltimore, Maryland

"Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

"George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia

"Loyola College, Baltimore, Maryland

"Maryland, University of, Baltimore County, Baltimore, Maryland

"Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland

"Salisbury State College, Salisbury, Maryland
"Towson State College, Towson, Maryland."

Source: NCAA Council (Mason-Dixon Intercollegiate Conference).

Intent: To transfer the eight members of the Mason-Dixon Conference to District 2 in view of the restructuring of the conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 242 TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 4, by deleting paragraph (c), page 71, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(c) From District 3 to District 5

"Louisville, University of, Louisville, Kentucky."

Source: University of Louisville.

Intent: To return the University of Louisville to District 3 membership in view of the institution's new conference membership.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 243 ELIGIBILITY—2.000 RULE

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6, pages 59-60, by deleting paragraphs (b) and (c), and all applicable subparagraphs and interpretations.

Source: Seton Hall University.

Intent: To rescind the 2.000 rule.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 244 ELIGIBILITY—2.000 RULE

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(j)-(1), page 53, as follows:

"(1) For entering freshmen with no previous college attendance (Division I only):

"a. For those who matriculated as 2.000 achievers, Financial aid and eligibility for competition and practice shall be limited only by institutional and conference regulations for those who matriculated as 2.000 achievers, or for those student-athletes who matriculated in institutions that have an applicable rule which requires progress toward graduation by earning at least twenty-four semester or thirty-six quarter degree credits by the beginning of the second academic year, and thereafter by earning additional degree credits to achieve an average of at least twelve credits for each academic term attended during

a regular academic year, including the freshman year. Credits earned in summer school, night school and/or extension courses which are accepted by the member institution may be counted in averaging for the regular academic terms. In member institutions awarding credit on other than a semester or quarter basis, progress at eighty per cent of a normal full-time load may be substituted.

"b. Except as permitted by the preceding paragraph in member institutions with an adequate progress rule, for those who matriculated as 2.000 non-achievers:"

[Remaining paragraphs remain unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 4, Section 6-(b), page 59, as follows:

"(b) A Division I member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless the institution has a progress rule at least as demanding as that specified in Bylaw 4-1-(j)-(1)-a, or in the conduct of its intercollegiate programs:"

[Remaining paragraphs remain unchanged.]

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To provide institutions a choice between using the 2.000 rule for entering freshmen or having an adequate progress rule as outlined above. The amendment would not change application of the 2.000 rule for transfers from a junior college or another four-year institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 245 ELIGIBILITY—2.000 RULE

[NOTE: The following proposals are applicable only to members of Division I.]

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(j), page 53, as follows:

"(j) He must conform to the following provisions for eligibility for competition and practice and financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree).

[Note: A 2.000 achiever as used herein is defined as one who at the time of his graduation from high school (as certified on his high school transcript or by official correspondence) presented an accumulative sixth, seventh or eighth semester minimum grade point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum 4.000), or, subsequent to graduation from high school, presented a minimum grade point average of 2.000 after at least one academic year of attendance at and graduation from a preparatory school, as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence by the registrar of the institution to be attended. For conversion of the grading system of a high school or preparatory school not utilizing the 4.000 system, the registrar shall utilize national conversion tables adopted by the NCAA Council.]

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(1), page 59, as follows:

"(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which

the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence, to student-athletes who have graduated from high school (as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence) with a minimum grade point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) for all work taken through the accumulative sixth, seventh or eighth semesters and certified *officially on the high school transcript by the registrar of the institution to be attended*, except that an institution may provide financial aid to a student whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (see O.I. 100) and whose admission and financial aid have been granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability; such a student shall not be eligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions unless he satisfies the requirements of Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(2) and there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies; [Note: For conversion of the grading system of a high school or preparatory school not utilizing the 4.000 system, the registrar shall utilize national conversion tables adopted by the NCAA Council.]

C. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 400, following Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(1), pages 59-60, as follows:

"O.I. 400. If a student reports for practice or competition before his high school grade point average has been certified by the institution's registrar, he may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of two weeks. After this two-week period, the student must have an established minimum high school grade point average of 2.000 to continue practicing or to compete."

D. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 401, following Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(1), page 60, as follows:

"O.I. 401. If a high school or preparatory school will not provide a student-athlete's grade point average or convert it to the 4.000 scale does not utilize a system of grading for which the NCAA Council has adopted a national conversion table, a member institution may submit the individual's high school or preparatory school transcript to the NCAA Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements for certification or conversion."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To remove the responsibility of determining an individual's eligibility for practice, competition and financial aid from the high school and place it with the registrar of the member institution attended and to specify that the NCAA Council shall adopt national conversion tables.

Effective Date: Immediately; applicable to all student-athletes first entering a member institution during the fall term, 1976-77 academic year, or thereafter.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 246 WAIVERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 3-(e), page 58, as follows:

"(e) The Council may, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, waive the residence requirement set forth in Bylaw 4-1 for a student-athlete who transfers to a member institution after loss of eligibility due to involvement in a violation of Constitution 3-1-(g) or Bylaws 4-1-(i) or 4-6-(b). The Council may waive these requirements only upon a determination of the innocent or inadvertent involvement of the student-athlete in the violation."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Testing and Requirements Committee).

Intent: To exclude violations of Bylaw 4-6-(b) from the forgiveness provisions of Bylaw 4-3-(e), thereby establishing that a sub-predictor under the 2.000 rule could not transfer and be immediately eligible after participating ineligibly at the original institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 247 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), pages 59-60, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(b) A Division I member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless the institution limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions to those student-athletes who meet the requirements of Bylaws 4-1-(j)-(1), (2) and (3), except that the provisions of Bylaws 4-1-(j)-(3)-a-1 and 4-1-(j)-(3)-b-1 shall not be applicable and the eligibility of the student-athletes described therein shall be determined by the transfer and eligibility rules of the institution and its athletic conference."

Source: Temple University.

Intent: To consolidate into Bylaw 4-1 by reference in Bylaw 4-6-(b) the like provisions of Sections 1 and 6-(b) applicable to Division I, thereby simplifying the existing requirements for the reader, and to set forth in Section 6-(b) the two differences between the two Sections.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 248 ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (m), page 58, as follows:

"(m) He must, if requested by the Executive Committee, sign an affidavit certifying his amateur standing under the provisions of Constitution 3-1.

"[Note: If the Executive Committee requires an individual entered in an NCAA championship to sign an affidavit attesting to his amateur status, such affidavit shall be administered by the chairman of the games committee and shall be taken on a form prescribed by the Executive Committee.]"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6 by deleting Section 6, page 69, as follows:

"Section 6. Individual Certification of Compliance. In addition to meeting the eligibility requirements specified in Bylaw 4-1, all participants in a National Collegiate Athletic Association championship must sign an affidavit certifying compliance with the amateur standing provisions of Constitution 3-1. This requirement shall be administered by each institution at least one week prior to the particular championship in accordance with a format to be specified by the NCAA Executive Committee."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To authorize the Executive Committee to require a student-athlete to sign an affidavit, if necessary, to verify his eligibility to compete in an NCAA championship and to eliminate the current provision requiring all participants in all championships to sign such affidavits.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 249 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(c), page 60, as follows:

"(c) Division I institutions which do not conform to have not operated in conformity for a period of two years with the requirements of Bylaw 4-6-(b) at the time they certify conformance with the regulation shall be ineligible for NCAA championships and appearances on the NCAA national football television program until they have operated in can show conformity for a period of two years. A Division II or III institution petitioning the Council for Division I institutional membership or eligibility in one sport must have operated in conformity with the requirements of Bylaw 4-6-(b) for two years preceding the Council's June 1 deadline for consideration of such petition, or be ineligible upon attaining Division I membership for NCAA championships and the NCAA national football television program until it can show conformity for a period of two years."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify existing requirements that a Division I member must be in conformity with Bylaw 4-6-(b) for a two-year period before being eligible, and to require Division II and III institutions petitioning for Division I membership or eligibility to show conformance with Bylaw 4-6-(b) for a two-year period

at the time the petition is considered by the Council in order to be immediately eligible.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 250 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(f), page 61, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II.]

"(f) A Division II member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament in a given sport unless it is in conformance with the Division II maximum awards provisions in that sport as set forth in Bylaw 5-5-(f) and the campus visit limitation in that sport as set forth in Bylaw 1-5-(a)-(2). A Division II member institution which desires to exceed the Division II maximum awards or campus visit limitation in a given sport or sports shall file a declaration of its intent to be exempt from that limitation with the NCAA national office prior to June 1 preceding the academic year for which it seeks the exemption, and such institution shall then be governed by the appropriate Division I maximum awards provisions of Bylaw 5-5-(b), (c) or (d) legislation governing maximum awards and campus visit limitations for that year."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit exempt Division II institutions to utilize Division I campus visit limitations, as well as Division I limitations on awards.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976, except that declarations of intent must be filed prior to June 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by Division II as amended (see No. 250-1, Appendix E).

NO. 251 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(f), page 61, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II.]

"(f) A Division II member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament in a given sport unless it is in conformance with the Division II maximum awards provisions in that sport as set forth in Bylaw 5-5-(f), except that a Division II institution may exceed the Division II maximum awards limitations in a sport in which only one NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament is conducted and remain eligible for that NCAA event. A Division II member institution which desires to exceed the Division II maximum awards limitation in a given sport or sports shall file a declaration of its intent to be exempt from that limitation with the NCAA national office prior to June 1 preceding the academic year for which it seeks the exemption,

and such institution shall then be governed by the Division I maximum awards provisions of Bylaw 5-5-(b), (c) or (d) for that year."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit a Division II institution, which elects to be governed by Division I maximum awards limitations in a sport in which only one NCAA event is conducted, to be eligible for the NCAA event in that sport.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976, except that declarations of intent must be filed prior to June 1, 1976.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 252 ELIGIBILITY

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(a), page 17, as follows:

"(a) He must complete his seasons of participation within *five six* calendar years from the beginning of the semester or quarter in which he first registered at a collegiate institution, time spent in the armed services, on official church missions or with recognized foreign aid services of the U.S. Government being excepted; **except that a student-athlete who transfers to an institution in another division must complete his seasons of participation within five calendar years.**" [Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: New Jersey State College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to complete his four seasons of participation during a period of six years if he returns to his original institution or transfers to an institution in the same membership division as his original institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Not introduced.

NO. 253 TRANSFER RULES

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(1)-(2), by adding new subparagraph j., page 57, as follows:

"(2) A student shall not be considered a transfer:

"j. If he changes institutions after his original four-year collegiate institution fails to renew his financial aid in the manner prescribed in Constitution 3-4-(d), provided the provisions of Bylaw 1-7 have been met."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference, New Jersey State College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To waive the residence requirements of the transfer rule under the described conditions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions.

NO. 254 TRANSFER RULES

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(1)-(2), by adding new subparagraph j., page 57, as follows:

"(2) A student shall not be considered a transfer:

"j. If he transfers to an institution in a competitive division which offers aid only on the basis of financial need."

Source: DePauw University.

Intent: To waive the residence requirements of the transfer rule for a student-athlete who transfers to an institution in an NCAA division which bases all financial aid on need.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 255 TRANSFER RULES

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(k)-(1), page 56, as follows:

"(1) A student who transfers from a junior college after attendance at any four-year college must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution, unless he has completed a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours at the junior college following his transfer from the four-year college and also has graduated from the junior college, and one calendar year must have elapsed since his transfer from the first four-year college, *or is readmitted to the four-year college first attended.* **The one-year residence requirement is not applicable if a student returns to the four-year college which he last attended prior to his transfer to junior college, provided he did not have an unfulfilled residence requirement at the time of his transfer from the four-year college.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that a student must not have any unfulfilled residence requirement when he leaves a four-year college to attend a junior college if he expects to be re-admitted to the original four-year college and be immediately eligible under the provisions of this legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 256 ELIGIBILITY

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9, by adding new paragraph (k), page 19, as follows:

"(k) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in all sports if, as a prospective student-athlete, he accepted expense-paid visits in excess of the number specified in Bylaw 1-5-(d). Such prospective student-athlete shall have the right to appeal for the restoration of his eligibility to the NCAA Council or a committee designated by the NCAA Council."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To specify that a prospective student-athlete who receives more than the permissible six expense-paid visits shall be permanently ineligible for intercollegiate athletics, and to estab-

lish a process of appeal for restoration of eligibility in such cases.

Effective Date: August 1, 1976.

Action: Defeated as amended (see No. 256-1, Appendix E), 123-80 (two-thirds required for approval).

NO. 257 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(c), page 51, as follows:

"(c) He must, at the time of competition, be registered for at least a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by his institution, which, in any event, shall not be less than twelve semester hours or twelve quarter hours or a similar minimum academic load, as determined by the NCAA Eligibility Committee, in an institution which determines registration other than on a traditional semester or quarter hour basis; or, if the competition takes place between terms, he must have been so registered in the term immediately preceding the date of competition. The twelve semester or quarter hour requirement of this paragraph may be waived for a full-time student who resides in his final (eighth) semester or (twelfth) quarter of his baccalaureate program, provided that his institution's registrar certifies that he is carrying for credit the course necessary to complete his degree requirements as determined by the faculty of his institution. The student granted eligibility under this exception shall also be eligible for NCAA competition which takes place immediately following said eighth semester or twelfth quarter; however, the student shall thereafter forfeit all eligibility. This waiver provision shall be administered by the allied conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Testing and Requirements Committee).

Intent: To enable a student-athlete's eligibility to be determined under Bylaw 4 when his institution operates on a unique calendar.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 258 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(c), page 51, as follows:

"(c) He must, at the time of competition, be registered for at least a minimum fulltime program of studies as defined by his institution, which, in any event, shall not be less than twelve semester hours or twelve quarter hours; or, if the competition takes place between terms, he must have been so registered in the term immediately preceding the date of competition. The twelve semester or quarter hour requirement of this paragraph may be waived for a fulltime student who resides in his final (eighth) semester or (twelfth) quarter of his baccalaureate program, provided that his institution's registrar

certifies that he is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete his degree requirements as determined by the faculty of his institution. The student granted eligibility under this exception shall also be eligible for NCAA competition which takes place immediately following said eighth semester or twelfth quarter; however, the student shall thereafter forfeit all eligibility in all sports. This waiver provision shall be administered by the allied conferences of the Association, or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the specific limitations implied by reference to the eighth semester or twelfth quarter while retaining all other provisions of the paragraph.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 263 ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(c), pages 13-14, as follows:

"(c) He is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as determined by the regulations of that institution, except that a student-athlete who has received his baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution he attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided he has athletic eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within four five years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference, Big Eight Conference, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Intent: To permit students who have completed requirements for baccalaureate or equivalent degrees to utilize any remaining eligibility during the five-year eligibility period established by Constitution 3-9-(a), provided that eligibility is utilized at the institution where the student-athlete studied and competed as an undergraduate.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated, 106-71 (two-thirds required for approval).

NO. 271 OUT-OF-SEASON FILMING

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 310, following Bylaw 3-2-(b), page 49, as follows:

"O.I. 310. The assembling of one or more members (who have eligibility remaining) of an institution's football or basketball squad for demonstration purposes in connection with a clinic or the production of a film is not permissible if it occurs outside the allowable playing and practice seasons; except that (a) if the television network which has the rights to the NCAA football television program series, the NCAA Film Service or

the NCAA Promotion Committee requests an opportunity to film the football squad team of a member college which is to participate in the television series, and the NCAA Council approves, said college may cooperate without such activity counting as a practice session; and (b) an institution which is conducting a project of the National Summer Youth Sports Program may employ football and basketball squad members in a supervisory and instructional capacity provided such employees do not engage in the practice of their respective sports."

Source: NCAA Council (Promotion Committee).

Intent: To permit member institutions to allow teams to participate in filming sessions for official NCAA films or approved promotional programs.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 272 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2, by adding new paragraphs (j), (k) and (l), page 42, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(j) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of its football game on the third Saturday in November or 6:00 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletic staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletic interests or student-athletes:

"(1) Shall not initiate contact in any manner with any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game to discuss the possibility of its team's participation in such game.

"(2) Shall not consider any formal or informal invitations, directly or indirectly, from any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game.

"A member institution which violates the provisions of this paragraph shall be prohibited from participating in any postseason football game for a minimum of two years.

"(k) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of a member institution's football game on the third Saturday in November or 6:00 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game:

"(1) Shall not discuss with a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletic staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletic interests or student-athletes the possibility of its team's participation in such game.

"(2) Shall not extend an invitation, either directly or indirectly, to the representatives of a member institution referred to in subparagraph (1) to participate in its game.

"The management of the certified game which violates the provisions of this paragraph shall return to the Association fifty

per cent of its share of gross receipts from the contest which were determined in accordance with Bylaw 2-2-(h) and Executive Regulation 4-1-(a), to be used in funding the NCAA post-graduate scholarship program.

"(l) The Extra Events Committee shall prepare certification documents which require the management of each postseason bowl game to enter into a contractual agreement through the NCAA certification program that provides the bowl management will abide by the provisions of Bylaw 2-2-(k) in consideration for receiving certification of its postseason bowl game following the 1975 football season."

Source: NCAA Council (Extra Events Committee).

Intent: To establish as permanent legislation the provisions of the resolution following Bylaw 2-2-(i), subject to modifying the time at which invitations may be extended and considered, and to tightening the provisions regarding contacts between representatives of member institutions and bowl managements.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions. Next-to-last paragraph was deleted after being ruled out of order due to lack of authorization in the Constitution.

NO. 273 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(c), page 41, as follows:

"(c) No member institution shall participate in more than one such game during any academic year; except that for that portion of the 1975-76 academic year that comprises the calendar year 1976, which is the year of our nation's bicentennial celebration, member institutions may participate in two such games if such additional postseason contest is approved by the Extra Events Committee as an event designed to further the bicentennial celebration. Notwithstanding any other provisions of these Bylaws, the Extra Events Committee may meet and determine events pursuant to this Bylaw."

Source: Southwestern Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a member institution to participate in two postseason football games if one of those games is designed to further the bicentennial and is so approved by the Extra Events Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II, 24-11, and by Division III; defeated by Division I.

NO. 275 AMATEURISM—AGENTS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(c), page 7, as follows:

"(c) Any student-athlete who agrees or has ever agreed has ever contracted orally or in writing to be represented by an agent or an organization in the marketing of his athletic ability or reputation in a sport no longer shall be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in that sport. An agency contract not specifically

limited in writing to a particular sport or particular sports shall be deemed applicable to all sports.; however, a student-athlete may secure The securing of advice from a lawyer concerning a proposed professional sports contract without violation of this provision provided shall not be deemed the contracting for the representation by an agent for the purposes of this rule unless and until the lawyer does not also represents the student-athlete in negotiations of the for such contract. Any individual, agency or organization representing a prospective student-athlete for compensation in placing the prospect in a collegiate institution as a recipient of athletically related financial aid shall be considered an agent or organization marketing the athletic ability or reputation of the individual."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To apply the agent rule on a sport-by-sport basis and to clarify provisions regarding agency contracts and the services of a lawyer.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 286 ORGANIZATION—MEETINGS

Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 6, by adding new paragraph (h), page 27, as follows:

"(h) All meetings of the Association shall be conducted in conformity with Robert's Rules of Order."

Source: Northern Illinois University; University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

Intent: To standardize the procedural operation of NCAA meetings within a specific parliamentary format.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 286-1, Appendix E).

NO. 290 AMENDMENTS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Section 1, page 30, as follows:

"Section 1. This Constitution may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted *in writing* to the Secretary of the Association by **written, wired transmission received at the national office by November 1 or by certified or registered mail postmarked by October 25** preceding an annual Convention, or sixty days preceding a special Convention."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 1, page 87, as follows:

"Section 1. These Bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted *in writing* to the Secretary of the Association by **written, wired transmission received at the national office by November 1 or by certified or registered mail postmarked**

by October 25 preceding an annual Convention, or sixty days preceding a special Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide the means of applying fairly the November 1 deadline for receipt of amendments.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 291 TELEVISION PROMOTIONAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(i), page 42, as follows:

"(i) Radio broadcasts and telecasts of such games shall conform to the same sponsorship restrictions which govern the broadcasts and telecasts of NCAA championship events (Executive Regulation 2-17). **During the telecast of a certified game, the promotion of other television programming shall conform to the same restrictions as those governing telecasts of NCAA championship events (Executive Regulation 2-16)."**

B. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 16, page 103, by adding the following new paragraph:

"During the telecast of any NCAA championship, there shall not be more than two promotional announcements for telecasts of professional sports contests. Each such announcement shall not exceed fifteen seconds in length, may be of a billboard nature only and shall not include any action footage of any professional sports contest. If less than the complete championship event is televised, then only one such promotional announcement shall be permitted."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Executive Committee (Extra Events Committee, Television Committee).

Intent: To provide that the restrictions on the promotion of other programming, particularly that for telecasts of professional sports events, be consistent for certified bowl games, NCAA championships and football games televised on the NCAA television series.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Not considered, but Part B remains in effect as an Executive Regulation adopted by the Executive Committee.

NO. 293 EXTRA EVENTS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 1-(d), page 75, as follows:

"(d) The Extra Events Committee shall consist of **six eight** members, **one from each of the eight NCAA districts, including and shall include** at least one member from Division II or Division III. Its duties and functions are set forth in Bylaw 2."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Committees).

Intent: To increase the membership of the Extra Events Committee from six to eight and to establish district representation on the Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions.

NO. 302 RESOLUTION: ATHLETIC INSURANCE

"WHEREAS, the membership of the NCAA has been greatly affected by the rising cost of athletic injury insurance; and

"WHEREAS, these rising costs have greatly affected the ability of member institutions to provide appropriate and adequate coverage for the student-athlete;

"Now, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the NCAA Council shall prepare a comprehensive report and plan for establishment and implementation of a paid basic athletic insurance program for member institutions in all NCAA-sponsored sports. The cost of the basic athletic insurance program is to be derived from assessments made upon the football television receipts and the receipts from the National Collegiate Basketball Championship. The plan for implementation of such a program shall be presented for consideration by the membership at the 71st NCAA Convention in January 1977."

Source: California State University, Chico; California State University, Fullerton; California State University, Long Beach; California State University, Northridge; California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo; Fresno State University; Saint Mary's College.

Action: Defeated.

Appendix C

70th ANNUAL CONVENTION

REVISIONS OF EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS

[The Association's Executive Committee is empowered by the Constitution to adopt Executive Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution or the Bylaws. Following are the revisions of the Executive Regulations as adopted by the Executive Committee during 1975. Those letters and words which have been deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which have been added appear in **bold face**. Page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1975-76 NCAA Manual. While the 70th Convention did not consider the Revisions of Executive Regulations, all remain in effect inasmuch as Executive Regulations adopted by the Executive Committee are in effect until overturned by an NCAA Convention.]

[Note: Additional proposed revisions of the Executive Regulations may be classified with similar subject matter and appear elsewhere in this Convention Proceedings.]

NO. 304 TICKET PRICES

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 1-(h), page 94, as follows:

"(h) Admission shall be charged at all NCAA championships. Ticket prices shall be determined by the respective games committees with the approval of the governing sports committee. All non-competing students and faculty members shall be charged regular admission prices, except that cheerleaders in uniform, not to exceed twelve in number, may be admitted without charge. Ticket prices may be 'scaled' according to the location of the seats."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To preclude special pricing arrangements for students and faculty members attending NCAA meets and tournaments.

NO. 305 CONDUCT OF MEETS AND TOURNAMENTS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (i), page 95, as follows:

"(i) In any National Collegiate Championship where a squad limit has been established by the governing sports committee or the NCAA Bylaws, the number of student-athletes in competitive uniform shall not exceed the prescribed number at the start of the contest; there shall be no delay of the contest to allow a competing institution to conform to the rule, and any violation automatically shall result in a forfeiture of the contest by the institution(s) in violation."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To establish a penalty for violation of the squad limits in NCAA championship competition.

NO. 306 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 2-(b)-(5), page 94, as follows:

"(b) Division II and Division III institutions may enter student-athletes in National Collegiate Championship meets and tournaments provided the institution and individuals meet the prevailing eligibility requirements and the following individual criteria of successful performance in the particular Division II or Division III Championships:

"(5) Tennis—first eight four finishers in singles and first eight four finishers in doubles in Division II; first two finishers in singles and first two finishers in doubles in Division III."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To establish the number of student-athletes from Division II and Division III Tennis Championships who may qualify to compete in the Division I championships.

NO. 307 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 2-(e), page 95, as follows:

"(e) When an ineligible student-athlete participates in an NCAA championship and he or the institution knew or had reason to know of his ineligibility, or a penalty has been imposed or action taken as set forth in Section 7-(a)-(11) or Section 10 of the NCAA Enforcement Program, ninety per cent or all except one unit of the institution's share of net receipts from such competition in excess of the regular expense reimbursement shall be withheld by the NCAA executive director or, if said funds have been distributed, the institution shall be required to return ninety per cent or all except one unit of its share."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To permit an institution to retain not more than 10 per cent of its share of the net receipts when it has been represented by an ineligible student-athlete in an NCAA championship.

NO. 308 ENTRIES

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 4-(a), page 96, as follows:

"(a) To be eligible to enter teams or individual student-athletes in NCAA meets or tournaments, an institution must meet the following criteria by the dates of September 1 30 for fall championships, December 1 for winter championships and March 1 for spring championships."

[Subparagraphs (1) through (5) remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To allow member institutions additional time to become eligible for fall championships, in light of the certification required in Bylaw 4-6-(d).

NO. 309 AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 5-(a), and add new paragraph (e), page 97, as follows:

"(a) Sports committees may recommend that a conference receive automatic qualification for teams or athletes into NCAA meets or tournaments provided the conference:

"(1) Is Has been an allied member of the Association for two consecutive years and has conducted competition in the sport in question for two consecutive years at the time of its application for automatic qualification;

"(2) Is composed of at least six members which sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis in the division in which automatic qualification is sought; further, for purposes of evaluating criteria for automatic qualification, the various sports shall be grouped as follows: (i) team sports—baseball, basketball, football, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, volleyball and water polo; timed individual sports—indoor track, outdoor track and swimming; other individual sports—cross country, fencing, golf, gymnastics, skiing, tennis and wrestling;

[Subparagraphs (3) through (6) remain unchanged.]

"(e) In the 'other individual sports' category above, a sports committee may grant exceptions to the six-team requirement, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Reorganization Committee).

Intent: To clarify the requirements for automatic qualification and provide a limited exception procedure in "other individual sports."

NO. 310 FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 8-(a), by adding new paragraphs (4), (5) and (6), page 99, as follows:

"(4) Institutions serving as host to first, second or third-round games of the Division I Soccer Championship shall guarantee net receipts of at least \$500.

"(5) Institutions serving as host to first, second or third-round games of the Division II Soccer Championship shall guarantee net receipts of at least \$300.

"(6) Institutions serving as host to first, second or third-round games of the Division III Soccer Championship shall guarantee net receipts of at least \$200."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Soccer Committee).

Intent: To re-establish guarantees by institutions serving as host in the early rounds of the three NCAA soccer championships.

NO. 311 FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 8-(b), page 99, as follows:

"(b) Gross receipts shall first be used to pay game expenses. Game expenses shall be those actual costs directly related to printing of tickets, ticket sellers, ticket takers, sales taxes, ushers, game officials, police, buildings and grounds expenses,

printing of entry blanks and related material, motion pictures of the competition (if authorized by the Executive Committee), reasonable entertainment, expenses of selection committees authorized by the sports committee and any other out-of-pocket expense directly related to the administration and conduct of the championship. The cost of permanent equipment, local transportation of competing teams or and facility rental charges are not permissible items of game expense. Any exception to the foregoing policies must be approved in advance by the Executive Committee."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To specify that local transportation of competing teams may not be included as an item of game expense on the championship financial report.

NO. 312 FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 8-(b), page 99, as follows:

"(b) Gross receipts shall first be used to pay game expenses. Game expenses shall be those actual costs directly related to printing of tickets, ticket sellers, ticket takers, ushers, game officials, police, building and grounds expenses, printing of entry blanks and related material, motion pictures of the competition (if authorized by the Executive Committee), reasonable entertainment, expenses of selection committees authorized by the sports committee and any other out-of-pocket expense directly related to the administration and conduct of the championship. The cost of permanent equipment or facility rental charges are not permissible items of game expense. Athletic department staff members of the host institution (e.g., athletic director, assistant athletic director, business manager, ticket manager, coaches, sports information director) may not be paid a fee or honorarium from receipts of an NCAA championship unless such payment is made from the host institution's share of the net receipts. Any exception to the foregoing policies must be approved in advance by the Executive Committee."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To clarify that payment of fees or honorariums to athletic department staff members is not permitted except from institutional funds.

NO. 313 ALLOWANCE TO HOST INSTITUTIONS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 8-(c), page 99, as follows:

"(c) Net receipts shall be the balance remaining after deducting game expense from gross receipts. An institution using its facilities in serving as host to an NCAA championship may first deduct five ten per cent or \$200, whichever is greater, from the net receipts to cover miscellaneous expenses incurred as a result of conducting the championship and not provided for by the budget or submitted under game expense. If an institution's department of intercollegiate athletics must pay a rental fee

for the use of an on-campus facility, such fee shall be deducted from the institution's share of the net receipts. No other sum from the receipts of an NCAA championship, or from any other source, shall be paid to the college or university sponsoring or acting as host to the meet or tournament, except to cover actual and necessary expenses directly incurred in the conduct of the championship as noted in paragraph (b) above. The remaining net receipts shall be forwarded to the NCAA executive director to be distributed in accordance with Sections 9 and 10 of this Regulation."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To increase the amount which a host institution may deduct from the net receipts of an NCAA championship conducted on its campus.

NO. 314 DISTRIBUTION OF NET RECEIPTS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 9, page 100, as follows:

"Section 9. Distribution of Net Receipts for Individual-Team Championships. The net receipts from those NCAA championships in which both team and individual championships are determined (cross country, fencing, golf, gymnastics, skiing, swimming, tennis, indoor track, outdoor track and wrestling) shall be distributed as follows:

"(a) Eight per cent of the net receipts shall be paid to the general fund of the Association."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To eliminate the NCAA eight per cent assessment and return additional moneys to institutions competing in individual-team championships.

NO. 315 DISTRIBUTION OF NET RECEIPTS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 10-(d)-(2), page 101, as follows:

"(d) Fifty per cent of the balance shall be distributed among the competing teams according to the following formulae:

"(2) Division I Basketball. A maximum of 152 units shall be awarded on the basis of two units per team for all games except that three units shall be awarded for the first game played by a team which received a first-round bye and three units per team shall be awarded for each game played at the finals. first-round games, four units per team in each regional tournament (regardless of the number of games played) and six units per team in the finals. An institution which received a first-round bye shall receive five units for its participation in the regional tournament."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Division I Basketball Committee).

Intent: To insure that all teams participating in regional tournaments receive an equal share of the net receipts regardless of whether they win or lose their first regional games.

NO. 316 DISTRIBUTION OF NET RECEIPTS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 10-(d)-(6), page 101, as follows:

"(d) Fifty per cent of the balance shall be distributed among the competing teams according to the following formulae:

"(6) Ice Hockey. A maximum of *eight twelve* units shall be awarded on the basis of one unit per team for each game played."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Ice Hockey Committee).

Intent: To adjust the formula for distribution of net receipts because of the increase in the ice hockey tournament bracket from four to six teams.

NO. 317 DISTRIBUTION OF NET RECEIPTS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 10-(d)-(7), page 101, as follows:

"(d) Fifty per cent of the balance shall be distributed among the competing teams according to the following formulae:

"(7) Lacrosse. A maximum of ~~22~~ 30 units shall be awarded on the basis of one unit per team for a first-round game (four teams shall receive byes), one unit per team for a second-round game, two units per team for a semifinal game and three units per team for the championship game."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Lacrosse Committee).

Intent: To adjust the formula for the distribution of net receipts because of the increase in the Division I lacrosse tournament bracket from eight to twelve teams.

NO. 318 DISTRIBUTION OF NET RECEIPTS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2 as follows:

A. Amend Section 9 by adding new paragraph (e), page 100, as follows:

"(e) When an institution is obligated to return its share of net receipts from an NCAA championship under the provisions of Executive Regulation 2-2-(e), such funds shall be considered additional net receipts from that championship and shall be distributed according to the formula in paragraph (d) of this Section."

B. Amend Section 10 by adding new paragraph (e), page 101, as follows:

"(e) When an institution is obligated to return its share of net receipts from an NCAA championship under the provisions of Executive Regulation 2-2-(e), such funds shall be considered additional net receipts from that championship and shall be distributed according to the formula in paragraph (d) of this Section."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To specify that when an institution is obligated to return its share of net receipts from an NCAA championship, such funds shall be distributed to the other participating institutions in

that championship according to the formula applicable to the meet or tournament in question.

NO. 319 SITE SELECTION

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 13-(a), by adding new paragraph (3), page 102, as follows:

"(a) NCAA championship competition shall be held on the grounds or in the buildings of educational institutions whenever possible.

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) remain unchanged.]

"(3) Governing sports committees shall consider revenue potential as the first priority in selection of sites for NCAA meets and tournaments. To this end, championships may be held at one site in consecutive years and geographic rotation shall be secondary in determining sites of NCAA championships."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To place revenue potential as the first consideration in selecting sites for NCAA championships.

NO. 320 SUNDAY COMPETITION

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 13-(b), page 102, as follows:

"(b) NCAA championship competition shall not be scheduled or conducted on Sunday, except as provided herein.

"(1) If an emergency develops which causes postponement of an NCAA championship, or if the competitive situation dictates a more expeditious completion of the meet or tournament, Sunday competition may be permitted provided the competing institutions are agreeable and advance approval is obtained from the NCAA Officers.

"(2) Competition in Games of the National Collegiate and National Collegiate Division II Association's baseball, soccer and tennis championships may be scheduled on Sunday afternoon or evening; however, if a participating institution has a policy against Sunday competition, the tournament schedule shall be adjusted to accommodate that institution and such adjustment shall not require its team or an individual competitor to play sooner than when it was originally scheduled.

"(3) Games in the Division II Lacrosse Championship may be rescheduled on Friday or Sunday to avoid conflicts with Division I tournament games, but only if the competing institutions agree."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To permit Sunday competition in the sports of soccer and tennis under the conditions described.

NO. 321 NCAA SERVICE MARKS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2 by adding new Section 14, page 103, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

"Section 14. NCAA Service Marks. The NCAA has the pro-

proprietary rights and interest in its name, logo, trademarks and service marks, both registered and unregistered, including its seal, the marks 'National Collegiate Athletic Association,' 'NCAA' and 'National Collegiate Championships,' and any derivative or similar mark likely to be confused therewith. It is necessary for the Association to control the use of its marks in order to preserve its ownership and rights.

"Any merchandise or material to be distributed or sold at an event sponsored or administered by the Association and bearing any insignia, mark or name of the Association must have prior approval and authorization of the executive director. Any unapproved or unlicensed material shall be barred from the premises."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To formalize the Association's control of its service marks and to prevent unauthorized sale of merchandise bearing one of the NCAA's service marks.

NO. 322 ADVERTISING

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 17-(b), page 103, as follows:

"(b) No commercial or advertisement may relate, directly or indirectly, the advertising company or the advertised product to the institutions or athletes involved, or to the NCAA itself, unless prior written approval has been granted by the Association's executive director."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To permit the executive director to grant exceptions for the purpose of furthering the NCAA marketing program.

NO. 323 COMMITTEE EXPENSES

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 3, Section 2, pages 104-105, as follows:

"(a) The payment of expenses of the members of the several rules committees for attendance at meetings of such committees shall be limited to one committee meeting per year for each committee.

"(3) A per diem allowance of *thirty-five forty* dollars may be claimed for each day, or part thereof, away from home, except that no more than one-half day's allowance may be claimed for the day of departure from the meeting since no lodging expense will be incurred on that day.

"(b) The payment of expenses of the members of the Executive Committee and Council for attendance at meetings of those committees shall be as follows:

"(3) A per diem allowance of *thirty-five forty* dollars may be claimed for each day, or part thereof, away from home, except that no more than one-half day's allowance may be claimed for the day of departure from the meeting since no lodging expense will be incurred on that day."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To increase per diem allowance for NCAA committee personnel from \$35 to \$40.

NO. 324 COMMITTEE EXPENSES

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 3, page 105, by deleting the present Section 3 and substituting new language, as follows:

"Section 3. Expenses of Delegates to Other Organizations. The expense allowance for NCAA delegates to attend the meetings of other organizations such as the various sports federations and the U. S. Collegiate Sports Council shall be the same as those outlined in Section 2.

"(a) NCAA delegates to games committees appointed for the purpose of supervising international competition may not receive expenses to more than one meeting during each academic year.

"(b) NCAA delegates to the governing boards of other organizations may claim an expense allowance for each regular or special meeting of the particular board."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To provide expenses for NCAA delegates to attend meetings of governing boards of other organizations, games committees of the USCSC and the various sports federations.

Appendix D

RESOLUTIONS ON WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

[NOTE: The following resolutions concerning women's intercollegiate athletics were prepared by the NCAA Council for consideration by the 70th Convention in compliance with the wishes of the 69th Convention which passed a resolution directing that "the Council prepare whatever proposals it believes necessary and desirable for consideration by the 1976 NCAA Convention." Votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated.]

NO. 325 RESOLUTION: APPLICATION OF NCAA RULES

WHEREAS, by resolution adopted by the 69th NCAA Convention January 8, 1975, this Association directed the NCAA Council to address the questions of rules administration and competitive athletic opportunities for women student-athletes and asked the Council to prepare proposals it believes necessary and desirable to this end; and

WHEREAS, the Council has concluded that preliminary to the preparation of specific plans and proposals, it is essential that a formal conclusion be reached as to the applicability of NCAA governing legislation to the varsity intercollegiate athletic teams of member institutions, including such teams made up of female student-athletes; and

WHEREAS, the Constitution and Bylaws by their terms purport to regulate intercollegiate athletics generally among the members and make no distinctions or exceptions based upon sex; and

WHEREAS, the Council has been advised by legal counsel that an affirmative act by amendment or interpretation of the NCAA Constitution and Bylaws to exclude or exempt women's varsity intercollegiate athletics would be invalid, and the Council believes that such an act would be inimical to the Association's ability to meet its present obligations;

Now, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That it is in the best interest of the intercollegiate varsity athletic programs of NCAA member institutions that rules be applied equally to the student-athletes who compete in those programs and the institutional employees responsible for those programs and effective September 1, 1977, the then applicable governing legislation of this Association shall be so applied, regardless as to whether the student-athletes and employees be male or female;
2. That "varsity intercollegiate athletic programs" are defined as those programs conducted by a member institution in which it designates a team or individual to represent it in varsity intercollegiate competition in a sport recognized by the Association; i.e., a sport in which the NCAA maintains a championship event for either male or female student-athletes, or both;
3. That this resolution in no way affects the present application of NCAA rules to those varsity intercollegiate teams and programs (and those persons responsible for said programs) in which male student-athletes are participating (see Case No. 1, page 209, 1975-

76 NCAA Manual) or an exclusively female team or program in a sport designated by the institution to fulfill the four-sport requirement for NCAA membership (see Case No. 129, page 242, 1975-76 NCAA Manual).

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Referred to NCAA Council for further study and consideration.

NO. 326 RESOLUTION: CHAMPIONSHIPS

WHEREAS, it is the policy of this Association to encourage the adoption of programs which will provide opportunities for female student-athletes to participate in intercollegiate athletics; and

WHEREAS, the Association stands ready to establish championship meets and tournaments for teams composed exclusively of female student-athletes;

WHEREAS, the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) now provides national championship meets and tournaments in 11 sports for exclusively female student-athlete teams and participants, and has clearly indicated its opposition to any action by this Association to establish championship events exclusively for female student-athletes;

WHEREAS, the extent of programs for female student-athletes now existing among the members may not be sufficient to warrant additional championship events at this time beyond those now provided by the AIAW; and

WHEREAS, the Association will continue to develop plans to provide opportunities for mixed competition of male and female student-athletes which now occurs occasionally in the Association's existing championship meets and tournaments.

Now, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that no championship meets or tournaments for exclusively female student-athlete participation shall be established by this Association for any season prior to the 1977-78 academic year, and thereafter as determined by the Association at the 71st Annual Convention.

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Tabled.

NO. 327 RESOLUTION: COMMITTEE AND STUDY PROGRAM

BE IT RESOLVED, that the 70th Annual NCAA Convention establish a committee on women's intercollegiate athletics to be composed of nine persons, with at least one representative from each of the eight NCAA districts and with at least two representatives from institutions holding membership in each of the three divisions of the Association;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Council shall appoint the committee for 1976 and also shall prepare the necessary amendment to the Bylaws for submission to the 71st NCAA Convention so that this committee will become one of the standing committees of the Association;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this committee shall be responsible for keeping the membership informed of developments in women's intercollegiate athletics and the legal and societal obligations of the NCAA in this area of activity;

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the committee or a subcommittee designated by it, shall continue during 1976 the discussions and study projects initiated by the 1975 Joint Committee of the AIAW and NCAA as described in the NCAA Council's report of December 3, 1975, with priority being given to an analysis of the governing legislation of the respective organizations and recommendations as to the steps each organization might take to bring the rules of the AIAW and NCAA more closely together.

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

Appendix E

AMENDMENTS TO AMENDMENTS AND OTHER PROPOSALS

[NOTE: The following amendments to amendments and other proposals were presented at the 70th Annual Convention. In the amendments to amendments, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted; and those letter and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to pages in appendices in this book containing proposals and supporting information which were considered by the Convention. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments to amendments upon which the 70th Convention took some action appear in this appendix.*]

NO. 100—1 DETERMINATION OF FINANCIAL NEED

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 100-B, page A-42, as follows:

"(e) The Council shall approve a form (see Appendix I) to secure information needed to make the calculation of the Expected Family Contribution. The form shall permit explanation of extraordinary situations which the student wishes considered in the calculation. The form shall be submitted to the NCAA, or its NCAA's designated agent, which shall determine the Expected Family Contribution and advise the student of the figure thus established. The figure shall be revealed to such member institutions as the student directs, and such institutions may offer or award aid as provided above in accordance with the stated figure.

"(f) The information in the form shall be kept confidential by the NCAA, or its NCAA's designated agent, except to the extent that the information may be material to questions of violation of NCAA requirements."

(All other paragraphs remain unchanged.)

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: Defeated by Division I, 102-121, and by Divisions II and III.

NO. 100—2 RESOLUTION: DETERMINATION OF FINANCIAL NEED

"WHEREAS, it has been proposed that this Association adopt a system of financial aid to student-athletes based on need, and

"WHEREAS, one of the principal goals of adoption of any such system is to reduce institutional athletic expenditures, and

"WHEREAS, there is uncertainty as to the extent to which athletic expenditures would be reduced by installation of the need system,

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

"1. Consideration of legislation designed to adopt a need system of financial aid to student-athletes be deferred until the 71st Annual Convention;

"2. Each active member of the Association making any initial award in 1976 of financial aid not based on need to one or more

student-athletes, female or male, shall require the recipient to file with it a financial aid application in the form and containing the information set forth in Appendix I (page A-149).

"3. On the basis of such information, and application of the Expected Family Contribution Formula contained in Appendix H (page A-143), each member to which paragraph 2 applies shall determine the amount by which its expenditures for financial aid to student-athletes would be reduced if the proposed need system were in effect during 1976.

"4. On or before September 1, 1976, each such member shall report to the Association its determination of the amount, if any, that would be saved by the proposed need system. Each such institution shall also calculate and report the amount it will have to expend on athletic scholarships for women if the current NCAA athletic scholarship formula is retained and if the HEW regulations requiring 'roughly proportionate' allocations of such scholarships between the sexes are determined to be valid.

"5. On or before October 1, 1976, the Association shall circulate information to all active members as to the amounts that would be saved, and the amounts necessary to fund athletic scholarships for women on the assumptions stated in paragraph 4, stating the amounts in such categories as shall be deemed advisable but without identifying individual members.

"6. On the basis of the foregoing data, the Council shall present to the 71st Convention such recommendations, plans, reports or proposals as it deems appropriate with respect to the adoption of a system of financial aid based on need.

"7. This legislation is of a temporary character. It shall be effective only until the 71st Annual Convention."

Source: University of Michigan.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 132—1 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 132, page A-56, as follows:

"(f) A Division II member institution may permit any number of uncompensated volunteers to participate in such coaching provided each such volunteer is a registered graduate student in that institution, receives no compensation or remuneration of any sort, including expenses, from the institution's department of athletics and is not permitted to recruit or scout off campus. or travel with the team."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 126.

NO. 134—1 COACHING STAFFS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 134, page A-57, by substituting the following:

"(i) These limitations on the number of coaches do not apply in circumstances where academic tenure, enforceable contracts or formal security of employment commitments in effect on August 15, 1975, make it impossible to comply with the limitations. These ex-

ceptions are continued until normal attrition makes it possible to comply with these limitations. Normal attrition shall be defined as the death, retirement or voluntary resignation of an employee or the discharge or transfer from the athletic department by the employer institution."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I, ruled out of order for Division II due to action on No. 126.

NO. 145—1 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 145, page A-61, as follows:

"Section 2. Size of Traveling and Home Squad. There shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to varsity competition being held away from the institution's home facility, and there shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may dress for or participate in varsity competition being conducted at the institution's home facility. The squad limitations imposed by this Section shall not apply to a member institution's participation in NCAA championship events, postseason football games or international competition taking place either in the United States or a foreign country."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order due to actions on Nos. 138, 139, 140.

NO. 152—1 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 152, page A-64, as follows:

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Home and Travel Squad. Fencing. Division I 12 15. Division II. 12 15. Division III. 12 15."

Source: Baruch College, New York University.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on Nos. 138, 139, 140.

NO. 152—2 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 152, page A-64, as follows:

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Home and Travel Squad. Lacrosse. Division I. 24 28. Division II. 24 28. Division III. 24 28."

Source: University of Maryland, Baltimore County; Loyola College; Towson State College.

Action: Ruled out of order due to actions on Nos. 138, 139, 140.

NO. 152—3 SQUAD LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 152, page A-64, as follows:

"Squad Size Limitations Table. Home and Travel Squad. Volleyball. Division I. 10 12. Division II. 10 12. Division III. 10 12."

Source: Springfield College, Westfield State College.

Action: Ruled out of order due to actions on Nos. 138, 139, 140.

NO. 178—1 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 178, page A-73, as follows:

"O.I. 106. Contact for the purpose of signing a conference or na-

tional letter of intent or similar appropriate institutional commitments shall be exempt as *an one of the off-campus contacts for recruiting purposes.*"

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Action: Accepted as editorial revision for No. 178.

NO. 215—1 OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP— LEGAL COSTS

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 215, page A-90, as follows:

"(f) To exhaust all procedures for appeal and review of institutional and individual eligibility actions permitted by the governing legislation of the Association before it shall seek any judicial remedies; further, any member which brings legal action against the Association (or of its members, Officers or agents), or *directly or indirectly* encourages or induces another to bring such a legal action, or fails to cooperate fully with the Association in the defense of such an action in which the Association is involved, wherein it is sought to stay the NCAA's enforcement procedures or eligibility rulings prior to fully exhausting NCAA procedures, may, when consistent with the results and upon termination of such legal action, and pursuant to the official procedure governing the NCAA enforcement program, in addition to all other disciplinary measures authorized under Section 7, be charged for all or part of the Association's actual expenses, including legal fees, incurred in defending such action, and may be subjected to disciplinary action and termination of membership for failing to fulfill conditions and obligations of membership under this Section."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

NO. 225—1 RESOLUTION: REORGANIZATION

Amend Proposal No. 225, page A-96, as follows:

(First two paragraphs remain unchanged.)

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee, in its initial reclassification, may place an institution in a given division even though it may not meet all of the criteria for that division if the Committee determines that the institution will be able to meet the criteria within five years in the sport of football and/or within three years in the sport of basketball; *except that no institution shall be reclassified unless it will have played at least five football and/or fifteen basketball games against opponents in the new division during the period September 1, 1974, through March 15, 1976;*"

(Last paragraph remains unchanged.)

Source: Southland Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order due to withdrawal of No. 125.

NO. 225—2 RESOLUTION: REORGANIZATION

Amend Proposal No. 225, page A-96, as follows:

(First two paragraphs remain unchanged.)

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee, in its initial reclassi-

fication, may place an institution in a given division even though it may not meet all of the criteria for that division; *if the Committee determines that the institution will be able to meet the criteria within five years in the sport of football and/or within three years in the sport of basketball;*"

(Last paragraph remains unchanged.)

Source: Southwestern Athletic Conference.

Action: See No. 225-1.

NO. 225—3 RESOLUTION: REORGANIZATION

Amend Proposal No. 225, page A-96, as follows:

(First three paragraphs remain unchanged.)

"BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Committee shall complete its initial reclassification not later than April 1, 1976; that all appeals for reconsideration by member institutions shall be concluded not later than May 1, 1976, and that all classifications shall be effective August 1, 1976. *However, the NCAA Council shall adjudicate and announce by January 18, 1976, the outcome of all appeals filed with the NCAA Interim Classification Committee prior to January 14, 1976.*"

Source: Central Michigan University.

Action: See No. 225-1.

NO. 225—4 RESOLUTION: REORGANIZATION

"WHEREAS, the formulation of the reclassification listings compiled by the Interim Classification Committee apparently has resulted in inequitable consideration of appeals by a number of member institutions; and

"WHEREAS, the NCAA Council believes it essential to establish permanent procedures for administering the classification requirements of the Association and further perfecting them as needed;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association hereby officially records its disapproval of the sample listing distributed to this Convention January 15, 1976;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the permanent NCAA Classification Committee be directed to review the advisability of creating Divisions I and I-A in the sport of football, review each member institution's present divisional status in that sport as well as any other divisional membership classification it deems appropriate;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in this process the NCAA Classification Committee shall hold hearings at the request of any member institution or conference and any member may appeal the Committee's decision to the Council;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the NCAA Classification Committee shall complete the review and other considerations outlined herein by July 1, 1976; that all appeals to the NCAA Council for reconsideration by member institutions shall be adjudicated not later than October 1, 1976; that notice of the final proposed classifications and related recommendations by the NCAA Council shall be mailed by it to all members before or with the Official Notice of the 71st Annual Convention and shall be subject to approval of that Convention;

"BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that procedures shall be established to as-

sure that voting on other issues before the 71st Annual Convention shall be on the basis of each member institution's present divisional classification or its classification as developed through the procedures described herein."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved, 180-135.

NO. 230—1 DIVISION I CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 230, page A-98, as follows:

"(a) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I in the sport of football, or to petition for a change of membership to Division I in that sport, must schedule more than fifty per cent of its games against members of Division I in that sport; **further however**, a conference member *must* which plays at least sixty per cent of its nonconference games in football against members of Division I in that sport to **may** qualify to petition for a change of membership to Division I **regardless of its conference schedule.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by Division I football.

NO. 231—1 DIVISION I CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 231, page A-99, as follows:

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I, or to petition for a change of membership to Division I, shall schedule at least seventy-five per cent of its basketball games against members of Division I; **further however**, a conference member *must* which plays at least ten nonconference games in basketball **and with** at least seventy-five per cent of its nonconference games *must* be against members of Division I to **may** qualify to petition for a change of membership to Division I **regardless of its conference schedule.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 236—1 DIVISION I-A CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 236, page A-101, as follows:

"Section 2. Criteria for Division I-A Membership. An institution which was a member of Division I-A as of August 1, 1976, shall conform to the following criteria for membership in Division I-A no later than August 1, 1981. An institution which applies for Division I-A membership subsequent to August 1, 1976, must meet the following criteria prior to making application.

"(a) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I-A or to qualify to petition for a change of membership to Division I-A, must schedule more than fifty per cent of its football games against members of Division I or Division I-A in that sport; **further however**, a conference member *must* which plays more than fifty per cent of its nonconference games in football against members of Division I or Division I-A in that sport to **may** qualify to petition for a change of membership to Division I-A **regardless of its conference schedule.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Ruled out of order due to withdrawal of No. 236.

NO. 240—1 DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 240-C, page A-103, as follows:

"(c) The total playing schedule for any intercollegiate football team shall be limited in any one year to a maximum of eleven contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition to be played during the traditional fall season, exclusive of one scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided that the game be with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students, or both, and exclusive of (i) one postseason game approved by the Association's Extra Events Committee or (ii) those games played in the National Collegiate Football Championship in any division, **except that a playoff in Division I shall be limited to one contest involving two teams.**"

Source: University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Action: Ruled out of order due to withdrawal of No. 240.

NO. 250—1 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 250, page A-109, as follows:

"Effective Date: *August 1, 1976, except that declarations of intent must be filed prior to June 1, 1976. Immediately, for declarations of intent filed prior to February 1, 1976; thereafter effective August 1, for declarations of intent filed prior to June 1 of the same year.*"

Source: Lafayette College.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 252—1 ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 252, page A-110, as follows:

"Effective Date: *Immediately September 1, 1977.*"

Source: New Jersey State College Athletic Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 252.

NO. 253—1 TRANSFER RULES

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 253, page A-110, as follows:

"Effective Date: *Immediately September 1, 1977.*"

Source: New Jersey State College Athletic Conference.

Action: Not introduced.

NO. 256—1 ELIGIBILITY

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 256, page A-111, as follows:

"(k) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in all sports if, as a prospective student-athlete, he accepted expense-paid visits in excess of the number specified in Bylaw 1-5-(d). *Such prospective student-athlete shall have the right to appeal for the restoration of his eligibility to the NCAA Council or a committee designated by the NCAA Council.*"

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: Approved.

NO. 286—1 ORGANIZATION—MEETINGS

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 286, page A-116, by substituting the following:

"(h) **Robert's Rules of Order (Revised)** shall be the parliamentary authority for the conduct of all meetings of the Association and shall be the deciding reference used in case of parliamentary challenge."

Source: University of North Carolina, Greensboro; Northern Illinois University.

Action: Approved.

NO. 325—1 RESOLUTION: APPLICATION OF NCAA RULES

Amend Proposal No. 325, page A-128, as follows:

(First four paragraphs remain unchanged.)

"Now, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

"1. That it is in the best interest of the intercollegiate varsity athletic programs of NCAA member institutions that rules be applied equally to the student-athletes who compete in those programs and the institutional employees responsible for those programs and effective September 1, 1977 1978, the then applicable governing legislation of this Association shall be so applied, regardless as to whether the student-athletes and employees be male or female;"

(Last two paragraphs remain unchanged.)

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Referred to NCAA Council along with No. 325.

NO. 327—1 RESOLUTION: COMMITTEE AND STUDY PROGRAM

Amend Proposal No. 327, page A-129, by substituting the following:

"WHEREAS, efforts to date of the 1975 Joint Committee of AIAW and NCAA have not been successful in drafting a plan for a single mechanism to govern both men's and women's intercollegiate athletics; and

"WHEREAS, it is in the interest of the member colleges and universities of each organization that there be such a proposed plan;

"Now, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the NCAA in conjunction with the AIAW establish a committee on women's intercollegiate athletics to be composed of nine persons who are faculty representatives from institutions belonging to both the NCAA and the AIAW;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this committee be appointed for 1976 and that it should continue during 1976 the discussions and study projects initiated by the 1975 Joint Committee of the AIAW and NCAA with priority given to an analysis of the governing legislation of the respective organizations and recommendations as to steps that can be taken to provide for the successful merger of the two organizations."

Source: Pennsylvania State University.

Action: Defeated.

Appendix F

SUMMARY OF LENGTH-OF-SEASON PROPOSALS

[This chart summarizes, by sport and by season, the basic provisions recommended in Special Convention Proposals Nos. 29, 36, 43 and 57.]

| Sport | Begin Pre-Season Practice | Date of First Competition | Maximum Playing Dates | Out-of- Season Practice |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Fall Sports: | | | | |
| Cross Country | 15 calendar days before first meet | 2nd Saturday in September | 10 | No limitation |
| Football | Current options unchanged | September 1 (unchanged) | 11 | 20 sessions in 36 days |
| Soccer | 15 calendar days before first game | 2nd Saturday in September | 13 | Prohibited |
| Water Polo | 15 calendar days before first game | 2nd Saturday in September | 10 | Prohibited |
| Winter Sports: | | | | |
| Basketball | November 1 | Last Friday in November | 26 | Prohibited |
| Fencing | November 1 | Last Friday in November | 12 | No limitation |
| Gymnastics | October 15 | Last Friday in November | 12 | No limitation |
| Ice Hockey | October 15 | November 15 | 30 | Prohibited |
| Skiing | November 1 | December 15 | 12 | No limitation |
| Swimming | November 1 | Last Friday in November | 14 | No limitation |
| Track, Indoor | November 1 | Last Friday in November | 9 | No limitation |
| Volleyball | January 10 | February 1 | 16 | Prohibited |
| Wrestling | October 15 | November 15 | 16 | No limitation |

| Sport | Begin Pre-Season Practice | Date of First Competition | Maximum Playing Dates | Out-of- Season Practice |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Spring Sports: | | | | |
| Baseball | February 1 | February 10 | 36* | 20 sessions in 36 days |
| Golf | February 1 | February 10 | 12* | 20 sessions in 36 days |
| Lacrosse | 30 calendar days before first game | March 15 | 13 | Prohibited |
| Tennis | February 1 | February 10 | 18* | 20 sessions in 36 days |
| Track, Outdoor | March 1† | March 10 | 12 | No limitation |

*Including any dates utilized for competition in permissible out-of-season period.

†February 1 for institutions with no indoor track program and no indoor competition.

Appendix G

PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING EXPECTED FAMILY CONTRIBUTION

1. From the Financial Aid Application Form calculate Adjusted Gross Income minus Amount of Deductions claimed, for each person for whom these entries are made. Find the total of these calculations. This sum gives the *Net Income* figure needed in order to use the table.
2. Add up the number of exemptions claimed by each person for whom income entries are made. For a two-parent family, subtract 2 from this total. For a one-parent family, subtract 1 from the total. The difference gives the *Number of Dependent Children* figure needed in order to use the table.
3. Go to following table (Appendix D). In column headed "Net Income," find the figure nearest to that obtained in 1 above. Opposite this figure, in the column corresponding to the Number of Dependent Children obtained in 2 above, read the figure for *Expected Family Contribution*.
4. An Expected Family Contribution may be adjusted as follows:
 - (a) *Other children in college*: The Expected Family Contribution is divided by an Adjustment Factor which is determined as follows:
 - (1) For each child in college who lives at home, add .50.
 - (2) For each child, other than the applicant, living at a college, add (1.00 minus the fraction of expenses paid by scholarship aid). Express per cent as a decimal. For example, 45 per cent = .45; $1 - .45 = .55$. Hence, in this case, .55 would be added.
 - (3) For applicant, add 1.00.
 Divide Expected Family Contribution by Adjustment Factor. This adjusted figure is then used in calculating the maximum allowable financial aid.
 - (b) *Applicant is self-supporting*: Calculate Net Income, as in 1 above, for the applicant (and spouse). Add 1 to the Number of Dependent Children for determining the table reading. This means that if there are no children, the table is read as though there were one child. If there is one child, the table reading for two children is used.

Illustrative Examples

Example 1: Father and Mother filed joint return; Adjusted Gross Income of \$19,175, Deductions of \$2,875; two dependent children, counting applicant, and dependent grandmother; only applicant is in college.

Net Income = \$19,175 — \$2,875 = \$16,300

In table, opposite \$16,300, under 3 Dependent Children (grandmother is counted in same manner as a dependent child), \$1,000 is identified as the Expected Family Contribution.

No adjustment is made, since no other children are in college.

Example 2: Father and Mother filed joint return; Adjusted Gross Income of \$23,300, Deductions of \$2,500; four children, counting the applicant; two children, other than the applicant, are in college, and one lives at home, other at college with 25 per cent scholarship aid.

Net Income = \$23,300 — \$2,500 = \$20,800

In table, opposite \$20,800, under 4 Dependent Children, \$1,505 is identified as Expected Family Contribution.

Adjustment Factor Computation:

1 child in college, living at home .50

1 child living at college, 25 per cent aid: 1.00 — .25 = .75

Applicant 1.00

Adjustment Factor 2.25

Adjusted Expected Family Contribution:

\$1,505 divided by 2.25 = \$669, to nearest dollar.

Example 3: Father deceased; Mother has Adjusted Gross Income of \$10,000, with 15 per cent standard deduction of \$1,500; four children, none in college other than applicant.

Net Income = \$10,000 — \$1,500 = \$8,500

This figure lower than any entry in table; Expected Family Contribution is zero; applicant may be awarded full aid.

An Adjusted Gross Income of \$10,000 or less, with standard 15 per cent deduction, would fall below the lowest entry in the table, thus indicating that the applicant would be eligible for maximum institutional financial assistance.

[NOTE: When the Expected Family Contribution Table is compared with that of the College Scholarship Service, it is relatively similar with regard to the columns for 1 and 2 dependent children. Thereafter, the NCAA Expected Family Contribution begins to be a lower amount than the College Scholarship Service formula and becomes increasingly lower as the number of dependent children increases.]

Appendix H

EXPECTED FAMILY CONTRIBUTION FORMULA

(Revised November 1975)

NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

| NET INCOME | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|
| 8600 | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8700 | 26 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8800 | 48 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8900 | 71 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9000 | 93 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9100 | 112 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9200 | 135 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9300 | 157 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9400 | 168 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9500 | 195 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9600 | 213 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9700 | 236 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9800 | 258 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9900 | 281 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 10000 | 300 | 22 | | | | | | | | |
| 10100 | 315 | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| 10200 | 333 | 67 | | | | | | | | |
| 10300 | 356 | 90 | | | | | | | | |
| 10400 | 375 | 112 | | | | | | | | |
| 10500 | 397 | 135 | | | | | | | | |
| 10600 | 416 | 153 | | | | | | | | |
| 10700 | 438 | 171 | | | | | | | | |
| 10800 | 461 | 189 | | | | | | | | |
| 10900 | 483 | 207 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 11000 | 502 | 225 | 15 | | | | | | | |
| 11100 | 525 | 243 | 35 | | | | | | | |
| 11200 | 547 | 261 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| 11300 | 570 | 283 | 70 | | | | | | | |
| 11400 | 592 | 301 | 90 | | | | | | | |
| 11500 | 615 | 324 | 110 | | | | | | | |
| 11600 | 637 | 342 | 125 | | | | | | | |
| 11700 | 660 | 360 | 145 | | | | | | | |
| 11800 | 682 | 378 | 160 | | | | | | | |
| 11900 | 705 | 400 | 180 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 12000 | 727 | 418 | 195 | 20 | | | | | | |
| 12100 | 750 | 441 | 215 | 40 | | | | | | |
| 12200 | 772 | 459 | 230 | 60 | | | | | | |
| 12300 | 795 | 481 | 250 | 80 | 0 | | | | | |
| 12400 | 817 | 499 | 270 | 100 | 20 | | | | | |
| 12500 | 840 | 522 | 290 | 120 | 40 | | | | | |
| 12600 | 862 | 540 | 305 | 135 | 55 | | | | | |
| 12700 | 885 | 562 | 325 | 150 | 70 | 0 | | | | |
| 12800 | 907 | 580 | 340 | 165 | 85 | 15 | | | | |
| 12900 | 930 | 603 | 360 | 185 | 100 | 30 | | | | |
| 13000 | 952 | 621 | 375 | 200 | 115 | 45 | | | | |
| 13100 | 975 | 643 | 395 | 215 | 130 | 60 | 0 | | | |
| 13200 | 997 | 661 | 410 | 230 | 145 | 75 | 15 | | | |
| 13300 | 1020 | 684 | 430 | 250 | 165 | 95 | 35 | 0 | | 0 |
| 13400 | 1042 | 706 | 450 | 265 | 180 | 110 | 50 | 20 | 15 | |
| 13500 | 1065 | 729 | 470 | 280 | 200 | 130 | 70 | 40 | 30 | |

NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

| NET INCOME | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 13600 | 1087 | 747 | 485 | 295 | 215 | 140 | 80 | 50 | 40 | |
| 13700 | 1113 | 769 | 505 | 310 | 230 | 155 | 95 | 65 | 50 | 0 |
| 13800 | 1140 | 787 | 525 | 325 | 245 | 165 | 105 | 75 | 60 | 10 |
| 13900 | 1166 | 810 | 545 | 345 | 260 | 180 | 120 | 90 | 70 | 25 |
| 14000 | 1192 | 828 | 560 | 360 | 275 | 195 | 135 | 100 | 80 | 35 |
| 14100 | 1218 | 850 | 580 | 375 | 290 | 210 | 150 | 115 | 90 | 50 |
| 14200 | 1245 | 868 | 600 | 390 | 315 | 225 | 165 | 125 | 100 | 65 |
| 14300 | 1275 | 891 | 620 | 410 | 320 | 240 | 180 | 140 | 115 | 80 |
| 14400 | 1297 | 913 | 640 | 425 | 335 | 255 | 195 | 155 | 125 | 95 |
| 14500 | 1320 | 936 | 660 | 440 | 350 | 270 | 210 | 170 | 140 | 110 |
| 14600 | 1346 | 954 | 675 | 455 | 365 | 285 | 220 | 185 | 150 | 120 |
| 14700 | 1376 | 976 | 695 | 470 | 380 | 300 | 235 | 200 | 165 | 135 |
| 14800 | 1406 | 994 | 715 | 485 | 395 | 310 | 250 | 210 | 175 | 145 |
| 14900 | 1436 | 1017 | 735 | 505 | 410 | 325 | 265 | 225 | 190 | 160 |
| 15000 | 1466 | 1035 | 750 | 520 | 425 | 340 | 275 | 235 | 205 | 175 |
| 15100 | 1496 | 1057 | 770 | 535 | 440 | 355 | 290 | 250 | 220 | 190 |
| 15200 | 1522 | 1075 | 790 | 550 | 455 | 365 | 305 | 265 | 230 | 200 |
| 15300 | 1552 | 1098 | 810 | 570 | 470 | 380 | 320 | 280 | 245 | 215 |
| 15400 | 1582 | 1120 | 830 | 585 | 485 | 395 | 335 | 295 | 255 | 225 |
| 15500 | 1612 | 1143 | 850 | 600 | 500 | 410 | 350 | 310 | 270 | 240 |
| 15600 | 1638 | 1161 | 865 | 615 | 515 | 425 | 360 | 320 | 280 | 250 |
| 15700 | 1668 | 1179 | 885 | 635 | 530 | 440 | 375 | 335 | 295 | 265 |
| 15800 | 1698 | 1197 | 905 | 650 | 545 | 455 | 385 | 345 | 305 | 275 |
| 15900 | 1728 | 1219 | 925 | 670 | 565 | 470 | 400 | 360 | 320 | 290 |
| 16000 | 1755 | 1237 | 940 | 685 | 580 | 485 | 415 | 375 | 335 | 305 |
| 16100 | 1785 | 1260 | 960 | 700 | 595 | 500 | 430 | 390 | 350 | 320 |
| 16200 | 1811 | 1278 | 980 | 715 | 610 | 515 | 440 | 400 | 360 | 330 |
| 16300 | 1841 | 1300 | 1000 | 735 | 630 | 530 | 455 | 415 | 375 | 345 |
| 16400 | 1867 | 1318 | 1020 | 750 | 645 | 545 | 465 | 425 | 385 | 355 |
| 16500 | 1897 | 1341 | 1040 | 770 | 660 | 560 | 480 | 440 | 400 | 370 |
| 16600 | 1927 | 1368 | 1055 | 785 | 675 | 575 | 490 | 450 | 410 | 380 |
| 16700 | 1957 | 1395 | 1075 | 805 | 690 | 590 | 505 | 465 | 425 | 395 |
| 16800 | 1983 | 1422 | 1095 | 820 | 705 | 605 | 520 | 475 | 435 | 405 |
| 16900 | 2013 | 1449 | 1115 | 840 | 725 | 620 | 535 | 490 | 450 | 420 |
| 17000 | 2043 | 1476 | 1130 | 855 | 740 | 635 | 545 | 505 | 465 | 430 |
| 17100 | 2073 | 1503 | 1150 | 870 | 755 | 650 | 560 | 520 | 480 | 440 |
| 17200 | 2100 | 1530 | 1170 | 885 | 770 | 665 | 575 | 530 | 490 | 450 |
| 17300 | 2130 | 1557 | 1190 | 905 | 790 | 680 | 590 | 545 | 505 | 465 |
| 17400 | 2160 | 1584 | 1210 | 920 | 805 | 695 | 605 | 555 | 515 | 475 |
| 17500 | 2190 | 1611 | 1230 | 940 | 820 | 710 | 620 | 570 | 530 | 490 |
| 17600 | 2216 | 1638 | 1245 | 955 | 835 | 725 | 635 | 585 | 540 | 500 |
| 17700 | 2246 | 1665 | 1265 | 975 | 850 | 740 | 650 | 600 | 555 | 515 |
| 17800 | 2272 | 1692 | 1285 | 990 | 865 | 755 | 665 | 610 | 565 | 525 |
| 17900 | 2302 | 1719 | 1305 | 1010 | 885 | 770 | 685 | 625 | 580 | 540 |
| 18000 | 2332 | 1746 | 1320 | 1025 | 900 | 785 | 700 | 640 | 595 | 555 |
| 18100 | 2362 | 1773 | 1340 | 1040 | 915 | 800 | 715 | 655 | 610 | 575 |
| 18200 | 2388 | 1800 | 1360 | 1055 | 930 | 815 | 730 | 665 | 620 | 580 |
| 18300 | 2418 | 1827 | 1380 | 1075 | 950 | 830 | 750 | 680 | 635 | 595 |
| 18400 | 2445 | 1854 | 1400 | 1090 | 965 | 845 | 765 | 695 | 645 | 605 |
| 18500 | 2475 | 1881 | 1420 | 1110 | 980 | 860 | 780 | 710 | 660 | 620 |
| 18600 | 2501 | 1908 | 1440 | 1125 | 995 | 875 | 795 | 725 | 675 | 635 |
| 18700 | 2531 | 1935 | 1465 | 1145 | 1015 | 890 | 810 | 740 | 690 | 650 |
| 18800 | 2557 | 1962 | 1485 | 1160 | 1030 | 905 | 820 | 750 | 700 | 660 |
| 18900 | 2583 | 1989 | 1510 | 1180 | 1045 | 920 | 835 | 765 | 715 | 675 |
| 19000 | 2610 | 2016 | 1530 | 1195 | 1060 | 935 | 850 | 780 | 730 | 690 |
| 19100 | 2640 | 2043 | 1555 | 1210 | 1080 | 950 | 865 | 795 | 745 | 705 |

NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

| NET INCOME | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 19200 | 2666 | 2070 | 1580 | 1225 | 1095 | 965 | 875 | 810 | 755 | 715 |
| 19300 | 2696 | 2097 | 1605 | 1245 | 1110 | 980 | 890 | 820 | 770 | 730 |
| 19400 | 2722 | 2124 | 1625 | 1260 | 1025 | 995 | 905 | 835 | 785 | 745 |
| 19500 | 2752 | 2151 | 1650 | 1280 | 1140 | 1010 | 920 | 850 | 800 | 760 |
| 19600 | 2778 | 2178 | 1675 | 1295 | 1155 | 1025 | 935 | 865 | 815 | 775 |
| 19700 | 2808 | 2205 | 1700 | 1315 | 1170 | 1040 | 950 | 880 | 830 | 790 |
| 19800 | 2835 | 2232 | 1725 | 1330 | 1185 | 1055 | 965 | 890 | 840 | 800 |
| 19900 | 2861 | 2259 | 1750 | 1350 | 1205 | 1070 | 980 | 905 | 855 | 815 |
| 20000 | 2887 | 2286 | 1775 | 1365 | 1220 | 1085 | 995 | 920 | 870 | 830 |
| 20100 | 2917 | 2313 | 1800 | 1380 | 1235 | 1100 | 1010 | 935 | 885 | 845 |
| 20200 | 2943 | 2340 | 1825 | 1395 | 1250 | 1115 | 1025 | 945 | 895 | 855 |
| 20300 | 2973 | 2367 | 1850 | 1415 | 1270 | 1130 | 1040 | 960 | 910 | 870 |
| 20400 | 3000 | 2394 | 1875 | 1430 | 1285 | 1145 | 1055 | 975 | 925 | 885 |
| 20500 | 3030 | 2421 | 1900 | 1450 | 1300 | 1160 | 1070 | 990 | 940 | 900 |
| 20600 | 3056 | 2448 | 1925 | 1470 | 1315 | 1175 | 1085 | 1005 | 950 | 910 |
| 20700 | 3086 | 2475 | 1950 | 1490 | 1330 | 1190 | 1100 | 1020 | 965 | 925 |
| 20800 | 3112 | 2502 | 1975 | 1505 | 1345 | 1205 | 1110 | 1030 | 975 | 935 |
| 20900 | 3138 | 2529 | 2000 | 1525 | 1365 | 1220 | 1125 | 1045 | 990 | 950 |
| 21000 | 3165 | 2556 | 2025 | 1545 | 1380 | 1235 | 1140 | 1060 | 1005 | 965 |
| 21100 | 3195 | 2583 | 2050 | 1565 | 1395 | 1250 | 1155 | 1075 | 1020 | 980 |
| 21200 | 3221 | 2610 | 2075 | 1580 | 1410 | 1265 | 1165 | 1085 | 1030 | 990 |
| 21300 | 3251 | 2637 | 2100 | 1600 | 1425 | 1280 | 1180 | 1100 | 1045 | 1005 |
| 21400 | 3277 | 2664 | 2125 | 1620 | 1440 | 1295 | 1195 | 1115 | 1055 | 1015 |
| 21500 | 3307 | 2691 | 2150 | 1640 | 1460 | 1310 | 1210 | 1130 | 1070 | 1030 |
| 21600 | 3333 | 2718 | 2175 | 1660 | 1475 | 1325 | 1225 | 1145 | 1085 | 1040 |
| 21700 | 3363 | 2745 | 2200 | 1685 | 1495 | 1340 | 1240 | 1160 | 1100 | 1055 |
| 21800 | 3390 | 2772 | 2225 | 1705 | 1510 | 1355 | 1255 | 1170 | 1110 | 1065 |
| 21900 | 3416 | 2799 | 2250 | 1730 | 1530 | 1370 | 1270 | 1185 | 1125 | 1080 |
| 22000 | 3442 | 2821 | 2275 | 1750 | 1545 | 1385 | 1285 | 1200 | 1140 | 1095 |
| 22100 | 3472 | 2848 | 2300 | 1770 | 1560 | 1400 | 1300 | 1215 | 1155 | 1110 |
| 22200 | 3498 | 2871 | 2325 | 1790 | 1575 | 1415 | 1315 | 1225 | 1165 | 1120 |
| 22300 | 3528 | 2898 | 2350 | 1815 | 1595 | 1430 | 1330 | 1240 | 1180 | 1135 |
| 22400 | 3555 | 2925 | 2375 | 1835 | 1610 | 1445 | 1345 | 1255 | 1195 | 1145 |
| 22500 | 3585 | 2952 | 2400 | 1860 | 1630 | 1460 | 1360 | 1270 | 1210 | 1160 |
| 22600 | 3611 | 2974 | 2425 | 1880 | 1650 | 1475 | 1375 | 1285 | 1220 | 1175 |
| 22700 | 3637 | 3001 | 2450 | 1905 | 1670 | 1490 | 1390 | 1300 | 1235 | 1190 |
| 22800 | 3663 | 3028 | 2475 | 1925 | 1690 | 1505 | 1400 | 1310 | 1245 | 1200 |
| 22900 | 3690 | 3055 | 2500 | 1950 | 1715 | 1525 | 1415 | 1325 | 1260 | 1215 |
| 23000 | 3716 | 3078 | 2525 | 1975 | 1735 | 1540 | 1430 | 1340 | 1275 | 1230 |
| 23100 | 3742 | 3105 | 2550 | 2000 | 1755 | 1555 | 1445 | 1355 | 1290 | 1245 |
| 23200 | 3768 | 3132 | 2575 | 2020 | 1775 | 1570 | 1455 | 1365 | 1300 | 1255 |
| 23300 | 3795 | 3159 | 2600 | 2045 | 1800 | 1590 | 1470 | 1380 | 1315 | 1270 |
| 23400 | 3821 | 3186 | 2625 | 2065 | 1820 | 1605 | 1485 | 1395 | 1325 | 1285 |
| 23500 | 3847 | 3213 | 2650 | 2090 | 1840 | 1620 | 1500 | 1410 | 1340 | 1300 |
| 23600 | 3873 | 3240 | 2670 | 2110 | 1860 | 1640 | 1515 | 1420 | 1350 | 1310 |
| 23700 | 3900 | 3267 | 2695 | 2135 | 1880 | 1660 | 1530 | 1435 | 1365 | 1325 |
| 23800 | 3926 | 3289 | 2720 | 2155 | 1900 | 1680 | 1545 | 1445 | 1375 | 1335 |
| 23900 | 3956 | 3316 | 2745 | 2180 | 1925 | 1700 | 1565 | 1460 | 1390 | 1350 |
| 24000 | 3982 | 3343 | 2765 | 2200 | 1945 | 1720 | 1580 | 1475 | 1400 | 1360 |
| 24100 | 4008 | 3370 | 2790 | 2220 | 1965 | 1740 | 1595 | 1490 | 1420 | 1370 |
| 24200 | 4035 | 3393 | 2815 | 2240 | 1985 | 1760 | 1610 | 1500 | 1430 | 1380 |
| 24300 | 4065 | 3420 | 2840 | 2265 | 2010 | 1780 | 1630 | 1515 | 1445 | 1395 |
| 24400 | 4091 | 3447 | 2865 | 2285 | 2030 | 1800 | 1645 | 1525 | 1455 | 1405 |
| 24500 | 4117 | 3474 | 2890 | 2310 | 2050 | 1820 | 1660 | 1540 | 1470 | 1420 |
| 24600 | 4143 | 3496 | 2910 | 2330 | 2070 | 1840 | 1680 | 1555 | 1485 | 1430 |
| 24700 | 4170 | 3523 | 2935 | 2350 | 2090 | 1860 | 1700 | 1575 | 1500 | 1445 |

NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

| NET INCOME | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 24800 | 4196 | 3546 | 2960 | 2370 | 2110 | 1880 | 1715 | 1590 | 1515 | 1455 |
| 24900 | 4222 | 3573 | 2985 | 2395 | 2135 | 1900 | 1735 | 1610 | 1530 | 1470 |
| 25000 | 4248 | 3600 | 3010 | 2410 | 2155 | 1920 | 1755 | 1630 | 1545 | 1485 |
| 25100 | 4275 | 3627 | 3030 | 2435 | 2175 | 1940 | 1775 | 1650 | 1560 | 1500 |
| 25200 | 4301 | 3649 | 3055 | 2455 | 2195 | 1960 | 1790 | 1660 | 1575 | 1510 |
| 25300 | 4327 | 3676 | 3080 | 2480 | 2220 | 1980 | 1810 | 1685 | 1590 | 1525 |
| 25400 | 4353 | 3699 | 3105 | 2500 | 2240 | 2000 | 1830 | 1700 | 1605 | 1535 |
| 25500 | 4380 | 3726 | 3130 | 2520 | 2260 | 2020 | 1850 | 1720 | 1620 | 1550 |
| 25600 | 4406 | 3748 | 3155 | 2540 | 2280 | 2040 | 1870 | 1740 | 1635 | 1565 |
| 25700 | 4432 | 3775 | 3180 | 2565 | 2300 | 2060 | 1890 | 1760 | 1655 | 1585 |
| 25800 | 4458 | 3798 | 3205 | 2585 | 2320 | 2075 | 1905 | 1775 | 1670 | 1600 |
| 25900 | 4485 | 3825 | 3230 | 2610 | 2340 | 2095 | 1925 | 1795 | 1690 | 1620 |
| 26000 | 4511 | 3852 | 3255 | 2630 | 2360 | 2115 | 1945 | 1815 | 1710 | 1635 |
| 26100 | 4537 | 3879 | 3280 | 2650 | 2380 | 2135 | 1965 | 1835 | 1730 | 1650 |
| 26200 | 4563 | 3901 | 3305 | 2670 | 2400 | 2150 | 1980 | 1850 | 1745 | 1670 |
| 26300 | 4590 | 3928 | 3330 | 2695 | 2420 | 2170 | 2000 | 1870 | 1765 | 1685 |
| 26400 | 4616 | 3951 | 3355 | 2715 | 2440 | 2190 | 2020 | 1890 | 1780 | 1700 |
| 26500 | 4642 | 3978 | 3380 | 2740 | 2460 | 2210 | 2040 | 1910 | 1800 | 1720 |
| 26600 | 4668 | 4000 | 3400 | 2760 | 2480 | 2230 | 2055 | 1925 | 1815 | 1735 |
| 26700 | 4695 | 4027 | 3425 | 2780 | 2500 | 2250 | 2075 | 1945 | 1835 | 1755 |
| 26800 | 4721 | 4050 | 3450 | 2800 | 2520 | 2270 | 2090 | 1960 | 1850 | 1770 |
| 26900 | 4747 | 4077 | 3475 | 2825 | 2540 | 2290 | 2110 | 1980 | 1870 | 1790 |
| 27000 | 4773 | 4104 | 3495 | 2845 | 2560 | 2310 | 2130 | 1995 | 1885 | 1810 |
| 27100 | 4800 | 4131 | 3520 | 2865 | 2580 | 2330 | 2150 | 2010 | 1900 | 1830 |
| 27200 | 4826 | 4153 | 3545 | 2885 | 2600 | 2350 | 2160 | 2025 | 1915 | 1845 |
| 27300 | 4852 | 4180 | 3570 | 2910 | 2620 | 2370 | 2185 | 2045 | 1935 | 1865 |
| 27400 | 4878 | 4203 | 3595 | 2930 | 2640 | 2390 | 2200 | 2060 | 1950 | 1880 |
| 27500 | 4905 | 4230 | 3620 | 2950 | 2660 | 2410 | 2220 | 2080 | 1970 | 1900 |
| 27600 | 4931 | 4257 | 3645 | 2973 | 2682 | 2431 | 2240 | 2099 | 1988 | 1917 |
| 27700 | 4957 | 4284 | 3670 | 2996 | 2704 | 2452 | 2260 | 2118 | 2006 | 1934 |
| 27800 | 4983 | 4311 | 3695 | 3019 | 2726 | 2473 | 2280 | 2137 | 2024 | 1951 |
| 27900 | 5010 | 4338 | 3720 | 3042 | 2748 | 2494 | 2300 | 2156 | 2042 | 1968 |
| 28000 | 5036 | 4365 | 3745 | 3065 | 2770 | 2515 | 2320 | 2175 | 2060 | 1985 |
| 28100 | 5062 | 4392 | 3770 | 3088 | 2792 | 2536 | 2340 | 2194 | 2078 | 2002 |
| 28200 | 5088 | 4419 | 3795 | 3111 | 2814 | 2557 | 2360 | 2213 | 2096 | 2019 |
| 28300 | 5115 | 4446 | 3820 | 3134 | 2836 | 2578 | 2380 | 2232 | 2114 | 2036 |
| 28400 | 5141 | 4473 | 3845 | 3157 | 2858 | 2599 | 2400 | 2251 | 2132 | 2053 |
| 28500 | 5167 | 4500 | 3870 | 3180 | 2880 | 2620 | 2420 | 2270 | 2150 | 2070 |
| 28600 | 5193 | 4527 | 3895 | 3203 | 2902 | 2641 | 2440 | 2289 | 2168 | 2087 |
| 28700 | 5220 | 4554 | 3920 | 3226 | 2924 | 2662 | 2460 | 2308 | 2186 | 2104 |
| 28800 | 5246 | 4581 | 3945 | 3249 | 2946 | 2683 | 2480 | 2327 | 2204 | 2121 |
| 28900 | 5272 | 4608 | 3970 | 3272 | 2968 | 2704 | 2500 | 2346 | 2222 | 2138 |
| 29000 | 5298 | 4635 | 3995 | 3295 | 2990 | 2725 | 2520 | 2365 | 2240 | 2155 |
| 29100 | 5325 | 4662 | 4020 | 3318 | 3012 | 2746 | 2540 | 2384 | 2258 | 2172 |
| 29200 | 5351 | 4689 | 4045 | 3341 | 3034 | 2767 | 2560 | 2403 | 2276 | 2189 |
| 29300 | 5377 | 4716 | 4070 | 3364 | 3056 | 2788 | 2580 | 2422 | 2294 | 2206 |
| 29400 | 5403 | 4743 | 4095 | 3387 | 3078 | 2809 | 2600 | 2441 | 2312 | 2223 |
| 29500 | 5430 | 4770 | 4120 | 3410 | 3100 | 2830 | 2620 | 2460 | 2330 | 2240 |
| 29600 | 5456 | 4797 | 4145 | 3433 | 3122 | 2851 | 2640 | 2479 | 2348 | 2257 |
| 29700 | 5482 | 4824 | 4170 | 3456 | 3144 | 2872 | 2660 | 2498 | 2366 | 2274 |
| 29800 | 5508 | 4851 | 4195 | 3479 | 3166 | 2893 | 2680 | 2517 | 2384 | 2291 |
| 29900 | 5535 | 4878 | 4220 | 3502 | 3188 | 2914 | 2700 | 2536 | 2402 | 2308 |
| 30000 | 5561 | 4905 | 4245 | 3525 | 3210 | 2935 | 2720 | 2555 | 2420 | 2325 |
| 30100 | 5587 | 4932 | 4270 | 3548 | 3232 | 2956 | 2740 | 2574 | 2438 | 2342 |
| 30200 | 5613 | 4959 | 4295 | 3571 | 3254 | 2977 | 2760 | 2593 | 2456 | 2359 |
| 30300 | 5640 | 4986 | 4320 | 3594 | 3276 | 2998 | 2780 | 2612 | 2474 | 2376 |

NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

| NET INCOME | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 30400 | 5666 | 5013 | 4345 | 3617 | 3298 | 3019 | 2800 | 2631 | 2492 | 2393 |
| 30500 | 5692 | 5040 | 4370 | 3640 | 3320 | 3040 | 2820 | 2650 | 2510 | 2410 |
| 30600 | 5718 | 5067 | 4395 | 3663 | 3342 | 3061 | 2840 | 2669 | 2528 | 2427 |
| 30700 | 5745 | 5094 | 4420 | 3686 | 3364 | 3082 | 2860 | 2688 | 2546 | 2444 |
| 30800 | 5771 | 5121 | 4445 | 3709 | 3386 | 3103 | 2880 | 2707 | 2564 | 2461 |
| 30900 | 5797 | 5148 | 4470 | 3732 | 3408 | 3124 | 2900 | 2726 | 2582 | 2478 |
| 31000 | 5823 | 5175 | 4495 | 3755 | 3430 | 3145 | 2920 | 2745 | 2600 | 2495 |
| 31100 | 5850 | 5202 | 4520 | 3778 | 3452 | 3166 | 2940 | 2764 | 2618 | 2512 |
| 31200 | 5876 | 5229 | 4545 | 3801 | 3474 | 3187 | 2960 | 2783 | 2636 | 2529 |
| 31300 | 5902 | 5256 | 4570 | 3824 | 3496 | 3208 | 2980 | 2802 | 2654 | 2546 |
| 31400 | 5928 | 5283 | 4595 | 3847 | 3518 | 3229 | 3000 | 2821 | 2672 | 2563 |
| 31500 | 5955 | 5310 | 4620 | 3870 | 3540 | 3250 | 3020 | 2840 | 2690 | 2580 |
| 31600 | 5981 | 5337 | 4645 | 3893 | 3562 | 3271 | 3040 | 2859 | 2708 | 2597 |
| 31700 | 6007 | 5364 | 4670 | 3916 | 3584 | 3292 | 3060 | 2878 | 2726 | 2614 |
| 31800 | 6033 | 5391 | 4695 | 3939 | 3606 | 3313 | 3080 | 2897 | 2744 | 2631 |
| 31900 | 6060 | 5418 | 4720 | 3962 | 3628 | 3334 | 3100 | 2916 | 2762 | 2648 |
| 32000 | 6086 | 5445 | 4745 | 3985 | 3650 | 3355 | 3120 | 2935 | 2780 | 2665 |
| 32100 | 6112 | 5472 | 4770 | 4008 | 3672 | 3376 | 3140 | 2954 | 2798 | 2682 |
| 32200 | 6138 | 5499 | 4795 | 4031 | 3694 | 3397 | 3160 | 2973 | 2816 | 2699 |
| 32300 | 6165 | 5526 | 4820 | 4054 | 3716 | 3418 | 3180 | 2992 | 2834 | 2716 |
| 32400 | 6191 | 5553 | 4845 | 4077 | 3738 | 3439 | 3200 | 3011 | 2852 | 2733 |
| 32500 | 6217 | 5580 | 4870 | 4100 | 3760 | 3460 | 3220 | 3030 | 2870 | 2750 |
| 32600 | 6243 | 5607 | 4895 | 4123 | 3782 | 3481 | 3240 | 3049 | 2888 | 2767 |
| 32700 | 6270 | 5634 | 4920 | 4146 | 3804 | 3502 | 3260 | 3068 | 2906 | 2784 |
| 32800 | 6296 | 5661 | 4945 | 4169 | 3826 | 3523 | 3280 | 3087 | 2924 | 2801 |
| 32900 | 6322 | 5688 | 4970 | 4192 | 3848 | 3544 | 3300 | 3106 | 2942 | 2818 |
| 33000 | 6348 | 5715 | 4995 | 4215 | 3870 | 3565 | 3320 | 3125 | 2960 | 2835 |
| 33100 | 6375 | 5742 | 5020 | 4238 | 3892 | 3586 | 3340 | 3144 | 2978 | 2852 |
| 33200 | 6401 | 5769 | 5045 | 4261 | 3914 | 3607 | 3360 | 3163 | 2996 | 2869 |
| 33300 | 6427 | 5796 | 5070 | 4284 | 3936 | 3628 | 3380 | 3182 | 3014 | 2886 |
| 33400 | 6453 | 5823 | 5095 | 4307 | 3958 | 3649 | 3400 | 3201 | 3032 | 2903 |
| 33500 | 6480 | 5850 | 5120 | 4330 | 3980 | 3670 | 3420 | 3220 | 3050 | 2920 |
| 33600 | 6506 | 5877 | 5145 | 4353 | 4002 | 3691 | 3440 | 3239 | 3068 | 2937 |
| 33700 | 6532 | 5904 | 5170 | 4376 | 4024 | 3712 | 3460 | 3258 | 3086 | 2954 |
| 33800 | 6558 | 5931 | 5195 | 4399 | 4046 | 3733 | 3480 | 3277 | 3104 | 2971 |
| 33900 | 6585 | 5958 | 5220 | 4422 | 4068 | 3754 | 3500 | 3296 | 3122 | 2988 |
| 34000 | 6611 | 5985 | 5245 | 4445 | 4090 | 3775 | 3520 | 3315 | 3140 | 3005 |
| 34100 | 6637 | 6012 | 5270 | 4468 | 4112 | 3796 | 3540 | 3334 | 3158 | 3022 |
| 34200 | 6663 | 6039 | 5295 | 4491 | 4134 | 3817 | 3560 | 3353 | 3176 | 3039 |
| 34300 | 6690 | 6066 | 5320 | 4514 | 4156 | 3838 | 3580 | 3372 | 3194 | 3056 |
| 34400 | 6716 | 6093 | 5345 | 4537 | 4178 | 3859 | 3600 | 3391 | 3212 | 3073 |
| 34500 | 6742 | 6120 | 5370 | 4560 | 4200 | 3880 | 3620 | 3410 | 3230 | 3090 |
| 34600 | 6768 | 6147 | 5395 | 4583 | 4222 | 3901 | 3640 | 3429 | 3248 | 3107 |
| 34700 | 6795 | 6174 | 5420 | 4606 | 4244 | 3922 | 3660 | 3448 | 3266 | 3124 |
| 34800 | 6821 | 6201 | 5445 | 4629 | 4266 | 3943 | 3680 | 3467 | 3284 | 3141 |
| 34900 | 6847 | 6228 | 5470 | 4652 | 4288 | 3964 | 3700 | 3486 | 3302 | 3158 |
| 35000 | 6873 | 6255 | 5495 | 4675 | 4310 | 3985 | 3720 | 3505 | 3320 | 3175 |
| 35100 | 6900 | 6282 | 5520 | 4698 | 4332 | 4006 | 3740 | 3524 | 3338 | 3192 |
| 35200 | 6926 | 6309 | 5545 | 4721 | 4354 | 4027 | 3760 | 3543 | 3356 | 3209 |
| 35300 | 6952 | 6336 | 5570 | 4744 | 4376 | 4048 | 3780 | 3562 | 3374 | 3226 |
| 35400 | 6978 | 6363 | 5595 | 4767 | 4398 | 4069 | 3800 | 3581 | 3392 | 3243 |
| 35500 | 7005 | 6390 | 5620 | 4790 | 4420 | 4090 | 3820 | 3600 | 3410 | 3260 |
| 35600 | 7031 | 6417 | 5645 | 4813 | 4442 | 4111 | 3840 | 3619 | 3428 | 3277 |
| 35700 | 7057 | 6444 | 5670 | 4836 | 4464 | 4132 | 3860 | 3638 | 3446 | 3294 |
| 35800 | 7083 | 6471 | 5695 | 4859 | 4486 | 4153 | 3880 | 3657 | 3464 | 3311 |
| 35900 | 7110 | 6498 | 5720 | 4882 | 4508 | 4174 | 3900 | 3676 | 3482 | 3328 |

NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

| NET INCOME | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 36000 | 7136 | 6525 | 5745 | 4905 | 4530 | 4195 | 3920 | 3695 | 3500 | 3345 |
| 36100 | 7162 | 6552 | 5770 | 4928 | 4552 | 4216 | 3940 | 3714 | 3518 | 3362 |
| 36200 | 7188 | 6579 | 5795 | 4951 | 4574 | 4237 | 3960 | 3733 | 3536 | 3379 |
| 36300 | 7215 | 6606 | 5820 | 4974 | 4596 | 4258 | 3980 | 3752 | 3554 | 3396 |
| 36400 | 7241 | 6633 | 5845 | 4997 | 4618 | 4279 | 4000 | 3771 | 3572 | 3413 |
| 36500 | 7267 | 6660 | 5870 | 5020 | 4640 | 4300 | 4020 | 3790 | 3590 | 3430 |
| 36600 | 7293 | 6687 | 5895 | 5043 | 4662 | 4321 | 4040 | 3809 | 3608 | 3447 |
| 36700 | 7320 | 6714 | 5920 | 5066 | 4684 | 4342 | 4060 | 3828 | 3626 | 3464 |
| 36800 | 7346 | 6741 | 5945 | 5089 | 4706 | 4363 | 4080 | 3847 | 3644 | 3481 |
| 36900 | 7372 | 6768 | 5970 | 5112 | 4728 | 4384 | 4100 | 3866 | 3662 | 3498 |
| 37000 | 7398 | 6795 | 5995 | 5135 | 4750 | 4405 | 4120 | 3885 | 3680 | 3515 |
| 37100 | 7425 | 6822 | 6020 | 5158 | 4772 | 4426 | 4140 | 3904 | 3698 | 3532 |
| 37200 | 7451 | 6849 | 6045 | 5181 | 4794 | 4447 | 4160 | 3923 | 3716 | 3549 |
| 37300 | 7477 | 6876 | 6070 | 5204 | 4816 | 4468 | 4180 | 3942 | 3734 | 3566 |
| 37400 | 7503 | 6903 | 6095 | 5227 | 4838 | 4489 | 4200 | 3961 | 3752 | 3583 |
| 37500 | 7530 | 6930 | 6120 | 5250 | 4860 | 4510 | 4220 | 3980 | 3770 | 3600 |
| 37600 | 7556 | 6957 | 6145 | 5273 | 4882 | 4531 | 4240 | 3999 | 3788 | 3617 |
| 37700 | 7582 | 6984 | 6170 | 5296 | 4904 | 4552 | 4260 | 4018 | 3806 | 3634 |
| 37800 | 7608 | 7011 | 6195 | 5319 | 4926 | 4573 | 4280 | 4037 | 3824 | 3651 |
| 37900 | 7635 | 7038 | 6220 | 5342 | 4948 | 4594 | 4300 | 4056 | 3842 | 3668 |

Appendix I

FINANCIAL AID APPLICATION FORM

FINANCIAL AID APPLICATION FORM
The National Collegiate Athletic Association

Name of Applicant _____ Birthdate _____
(last) (first) (middle)
Street Address _____ Applicant's Marital Status _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____ If Applicant has children, how many? _____
Was applicant claimed as dependent on 1975 Federal Income Tax Return filed by parent (or guardian) Yes _____; No _____

INCOME INFORMATION

A. 1974—Refer to 1974 Federal Income Tax Returns and include all income received in 1974.

| | Father (or Guardian) | Mother | Applicant | Applicant's Spouse |
|---|----------------------|----------|--|--------------------|
| Name | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Social Security Number | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Filed 1974 Federal Tax Return? ("Yes" or "No") | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| If joint return, with whom? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 1974 Adjusted Gross Income (Copy from Form 1040, Line 15) | \$ _____ | \$ _____ | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| | | | (for applicant only, do not include income from wages or salary) | |
| Amount of Deductions claimed (Copy from Form 1040, Schedule A, Line 41 or enter 15% of Adjusted Gross Income) | \$ _____ | \$ _____ | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| Number of exemptions claimed (Copy from Form 1040, Line 7) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

B. 1975—Refer to 1975 Federal Income Tax Returns (if completed and filed) and include all income received in 1975.

| | Father (or Guardian) | Mother | Applicant | Applicant's Spouse |
|--|----------------------|----------|--|--------------------|
| Name | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Social Security Number | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Filed 1975 Federal Tax Return? ("Yes" or "No") | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| If joint return, with whom? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 1975 Adjusted Gross Income (Copy from Form 1040, Line 15) | \$ _____ | \$ _____ | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| | | | (for applicant only, do not include income from wages or salary) | |
| Amount of Deductions claimed (Copy from Form 1040, Schedule A, Line 41, or enter 15% of Adjusted Gross Income) | \$ _____ | \$ _____ | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| Number of exemptions claimed (Copy from Form 1040, Line 7) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Financial Aid Application Form (Continued)

C. List all brothers and sisters of applicant or other persons who attend college anywhere and who are claimed as Federal Income Tax exemptions by applicant's parents (or guardian):

| NAME | AGE | GRADE | NAME OF COLLEGE | DOES CHILD LIVE AT HOME OR COLLEGE? | If living at college, what per cent of living and college expenses are paid by scholarship or grant-in-aid funds? |
|------|-----|-------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

D. List any other persons claimed as Federal Income Tax exemptions by applicant's parents (or guardian):

| NAME | ADDRESS | RELATIONSHIP | AGE |
|------|---------|--------------|-----|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

E. Describe any extraordinary circumstances which applicant and his family believe should be considered in determining the Expected Family Contribution.

We certify that, to the best of our knowledge, the information given herein is correct and complete. We authorize the National Collegiate Athletic Association to use this information solely for the purpose of determining the "Expected Family Contribution" under the terms of NCAA financial aid legislation, and agree that it has our permission to verify the information contained herein. We agree to release copies of our Federal Income Tax Returns, upon request, to the National Collegiate Athletic Association solely for the purpose herein stated.

Father (or guardian) _____ Date _____
 Mother _____ Date _____
 Applicant _____ Date _____
 Applicant's Spouse _____ Date _____

Appendix J

DIVISION I ROLL CALL VOTE ON PROPOSAL NO. 100

[NOTE: See No. 100, Appendix B, for the actions which led to the first roll call vote in the history of the Association.]

The vote by Districts:

| | Yes | No |
|--------|-----|-----|
| 1. | 12 | 2 |
| 2. | 22 | 18 |
| 3. | 15 | 36 |
| 4. | 19 | 12 |
| 5. | 9 | 11 |
| 6. | 3 | 15 |
| 7. | 7 | 12 |
| 8. | 17 | 6 |
| Allied | 8 | 8 |
| | 112 | 120 |

The vote by members of allied conferences, not including the conference's own vote:

| | |
|-----------------|------|
| Atlantic Coast | 5-2 |
| Big Eight | 0-8 |
| Big Sky | 4-3 |
| Big Ten | 3-7 |
| East Coast | 5-6 |
| Ivy Group | 7-0 |
| Metropolitan | 4-2 |
| Mid-American | 10-0 |
| Missouri Valley | 5-1 |
| Ohio Valley | 1-7 |
| PCAA | 5-0 |
| Pacific-8 | 6-2 |
| Southeastern | 1-9 |
| Southern | 4-4 |
| Southland | 0-5 |
| Southwest | 2-7 |
| Western | 0-8 |
| Yankee | 7-0 |

YES

District 1

Boston University
Brown
Connecticut
Dartmouth
Fairfield
Harvard
Maine, Orono
Massachusetts
New Hampshire
Rhode Island
Vermont
Yale

District 2

Bucknell
Buffalo State
Canisius

Colgate
Columbia
Delaware
Fairleigh Dickinson,
Teaneck
Fordham
George Washington
Georgetown
Hofstra
Lafayette
Lehigh
Long Island
Manhattan
New York Univ.
Pennsylvania
Princeton
St. Francis (Pa.)
Seton Hall
Syracuse
Villanova

District 3

Baptist
Davidson
Duke
Furman
Georgia Tech
Jacksonville
Maryland
Murray State
North Carolina St.
Tulane
Vanderbilt-
Peabody
Virginia
VMI
Wake Forest
William & Mary

District 4

Ball State
Bowling Green St.
Central Michigan
DePaul
Eastern Michigan
Illinois State
Indiana State
Kent State
Marquette
Marshall
Miami (Ohio)
Minnesota, Twin
Cities
Northern Illinois
Northwestern
Ohio
Toledo
Western Michigan
Wisconsin, Madison
Wisconsin,
Milwaukee

District 5

Bradley
Creighton
Drake
Louisville
New Mexico State
St. Louis
Tulsa
West Texas State
Wichita State

District 6

Centenary
Rice
Southern Methodist

District 7

Denver
Gonzaga
Idaho State
Montana
Montana State
Northern Colorado
Weber State

District 8

UCLA
UCSB
Fresno State
Fullerton State
Long Beach State
Oregon
Oregon State
Pacific
Pepperdine
Portland
Portland State
St. Mary's
San Francisco
San Jose State
Stanford
Washington
Washington State

Allied

Atlantic Coast
Conference
Big Sky Conference
Ivy League
Mid-American
Athletic Conf.
Metropolitan
Collegiate
Athletic Conf.
Pacific Coast
Athletic Assn.
Pacific-8
Conference
Yankee Conference

NO

District 1

Boston College
Northeastern

District 2

American
Drexel
Duquesne
Howard
LaSalle
Maryland (Eastern Shore)
Niagara
Penn State
Pittsburgh
Rutgers
St. Bonaventure
St. Francis (N.Y.)
St. John's (N.Y.)
St. Joseph's (Pa.)
St. Peter's
Temple
West Chester State
West Virginia

District 3

Alabama
Appalachian State
Auburn
Austin Peay
Citadel
Clemson
East Carolina
East Tenn. State
Eastern Kentucky
Florida
Florida State
Georgia
Georgia Southern
Kentucky
Louisiana State
Memphis State
Mercer
Miami (Fla.)
Middle Tenn. State
Mississippi
Mississippi State
Morehead State
North Carolina, Chapel Hill
North Carolina, Charlotte
Northeast Louisiana
Richmond
Samford
South Alabama
South Carolina
South Carolina St.
South Florida

So. Mississippi
Tennessee
Tennessee Tech
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Western Kentucky

District 4

Butler
Cincinnati
Cleveland State
Dayton
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Michigan
Michigan State
Notre Dame
Ohio State
Purdue

District 5

Colorado
Iowa State
Kansas
Kansas State
Missouri
Nebraska
North Texas State
Oklahoma
Oklahoma State
Oral Roberts
Southern Illinois

District 6

Arkansas
Arkansas State
Baylor
Hardin-Simmons
Houston
Houston Baptist
Lamar
Louisiana Tech
McNeese State
Pan American
Texas, Arlington
Texas, Austin
Texas A&M
Texas Christian
Texas Tech

District 7

Arizona
Arizona State
Boise State
Brigham Young
Colorado State
Idaho
New Mexico
Northern Arizona
Texas, El Paso
Utah
Utah State
Wyoming

District 8

California
Hawaii
Nevada, Las Vegas
Nevada, Reno
San Diego State
Southern California

Allied

Big Eight
Conference
Big Ten Conference
Missouri Valley
Conference
Ohio Valley
Conference
Southeastern
Conference
Southland
Conference
Southwest Athletic
Conference
Western Athletic
Conference

Abstentions

District 1

none

District 2

U.S. Military
Academy
U.S. Naval
Academy

District 3

none

District 4

none

District 5

none

District 6

none

District 7

U.S. Air Force
Academy

District 8

none

Allied

East Coast
Conference
Southern
Conference

Appendix K

3rd SPECIAL CONVENTION 70th ANNUAL CONVENTION

Nominating Committee

Chairman—J. Neils Thompson

District 1—William J. Flynn, Boston College
District 2—Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College
District 3—Hansel E. Tookes, Florida A&M University
District 4—Edwin L. Saxer, University of Toledo
District 5—Lawrence K. Albus, St. Louis University
District 6—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin
District 7—Clarence H. Kellogg, Regis College
District 8—Edward S. Betz, University of the Pacific
At-Large—Col. William J. Schuder, U.S. Military Academy
At-Large—Edward W. Malan, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges
At-Large—Raymond E. Didier, Nicholls State University
At-Large—Fred M. Martinelli, Ashland College

Committee on Committees

Chairman—Eugene F. Corrigan

District 1—Donald M. Russell, Wesleyan University
District 2—David B. Eavenson, Dickinson College
District 3—Peter R. Elliott, University of Miami
District 4—J. Edward Weaver, Ohio State University
District 5—A. L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
District 6—Kenneth Herrick, Texas Christian University
District 7—Fritz S. Brennecke, Colorado School of Mines
District 8—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
At-Large—Edwin W. Lawrence, Cheyney State College
At-Large—Edwin B. Crowder, University of Colorado
At-Large—Joe W. McDaniel, Marietta College
At-Large—Eugene F. Corrigan, University of Virginia

Committee on Voting

Chairman—Aldo A. Sebben

District 1—Robert W. Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
District 2—David B. Eavenson, Dickinson College
District 3—Mandell Glicksburg, University of Florida
District 4—Leo Vander Beek, Western Michigan University
District 5—Keith Colson, New Mexico State University
District 6—Harry H. Fouke, University of Houston
District 7—George C. McCarty, University of Wyoming
District 8—Donald Warhurst, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
At-Large—Aldo A. Sebben, Southwest Missouri State University

Committee on Memorial Resolutions

Chairman—Robert H. Frailey

Robert H. Frailey, American University

Ronald D. Roberts, Lawrence University

Joe L. Singleton, University of California, Davis

Committee on Credentials

Chairman—Vannette W. Johnson

Ralph H. Coleman, University of Evansville

Vannette W. Johnson, University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff

John W. Sawyer, Wake Forest University

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

Chairman of Business Sessions

John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University

Chairman of General Round Table

Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University

Appendix L

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

President

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 1906-1913 | Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy |
| 1914-1916 | LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University |
| 1917-1929 | Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy |
| 1930-1932 | Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University |
| 1933-1937 | Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference |
| 1938-1940 | William B. Owens, Stanford University |
| 1941-1944 | Philip O. Badger, New York University |
| 1945-1946 | Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming |
| 1947-1949 | Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa |
| 1950-1952 | Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California |
| 1953-1954 | Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama |
| 1955-1956 | Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College |
| 1957-1958 | Frank N. Gardner, Drake University |
| 1959-1960 | Herbert J. Dorricott, Western Colorado State College |
| 1961-1962 | Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University |
| 1963-1964 | Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa |
| 1965-1966 | Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University |
| 1967-1968 | Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan |
| 1969-1970 | Harry M. Cross, University of Washington |
| 1971-1972 | Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee |
| 1973-1974 | Alan J. Chapman, Rice University |
| 1975- | John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University |

Secretary-Treasurer

| | |
|------------|--|
| *1906-1908 | Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University |
| *1908 | William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia |
| 1909-1939 | Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University |
| 1940-1944 | Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference |
| 1945-1951 | Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference |
| 1952-1954 | Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska |
| 1955-1956 | Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan |
| 1957-1958 | Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr., Southern Methodist University |
| 1959-1960 | Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University |
| 1961-1962 | Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University |
| 1963-1964 | Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University |
| 1965-1966 | Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines |
| 1967-1968 | Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University |
| 1969-1970 | William J. Flynn, Boston College |
| 1971-1972 | Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, District of Columbia Teachers College |
| 1973-1974 | Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University |
| 1975- | Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University |

*Bevier served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

1-1976

Wallick)
(er)
(er)
(s)
(re)
(a)
(a)
(er)
(
(ford)
(on)
(
(e)
(
(nat)
(use)
(s)
(
(ont Inn)
(ont Inn)

December. No meet-
the Convention has
Conventions were
held just prior to

January 10-12

y 11-13

DATE DUE

[illegible]

Demco No. 62-0549